

Islamic Roots of Capitalism

Egypt, 1760–1840

Islamic Roots of Capitalism

Egypt, 1760–1840

PETER GRAN

Foreword by Afaf Lutfi Al-Sayyid Marsot

1




Syracuse University Press

Copyright © 1998 by Syracuse University Press
Syracuse, New York 13244-5160
All Rights Reserved

First Syracuse University Press Edition 1998
98 99 00 01 02 03 6 5 4 3 2 1

Originally published in 1979 by the University of Texas Press.

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements
of American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence
of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984. 

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Gran, Peter, 1941–

Islamic roots of capitalism : Egypt, 1760–1840 / by Peter Gran ;
foreword by Afaf Lutfi al-Sayyid Marsot.

p. cm. — (Middle East studies beyond dominant paradigms)

Originally published: Austin : University of Texas Press, c1979.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-8156-0506-4 (pbk. : alk. paper)

1. Egypt—History—1517–1882. 2. Egypt—Economic
conditions—1517–1882. 3. Islam—Egypt. 4. Capitalism—Religious
aspects—Islam. I. Title. II. Series.

DT97.G7 1998

962'.03—DC21 97-37419

Manufactured in the United States of America

Contents

Foreword	vii
Preface	ix
Introduction	xi
A Note on Critical Reception	xliii
Introduction to the Original Edition	li
1. The Social and Economic History of Egypt, 1760–1815: A Study in Merchant Capital and Its Transformation	3
2. The Religious Framework of the Eighteenth-Century Revival	35
3. The Cultural Revival of the Late Eighteenth Century: Literature, Language Sciences, and History	57
4. The Decline of the Eighteenth-Century Cultural Revival: The Formation of Shaykh Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār	76
5. Turkey and Syria in the Early Nineteenth Century: The Travels of al-ʿAṭṭār and the Preparation for Egyptian Reform	92
6. The Muḥammad ʿAlī Period, 1815–1837: State Commercial Sector and the Second Phase of the Cultural Awakening in Egypt	111
7. The Revival of Theology and <i>Kalām</i> : Hallmarks of the Culture of the State Commercial Sector	132
8. The Reform Period, 1815–1837, and the Development of Neoclassical Culture: The Study of Language Sciences, Literature, and History	151
9. The World Market as a Limiting Factor in the Development of Neoclassicism: The Case of Science and Medicine	165
10. Conclusion	178
Appendices	
I. The <i>Maqāmat al-ʿAṭṭār</i>	189
II. Al-ʿAṭṭār’s Itinerary from 1802 to 1810	192
III. The Writings of Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār	197
Notes	209

Glossary	251
Selected Bibliography	257
Index of Terms and Concepts	271
Index of Names	274

Foreword

In the past, eighteenth-century Egyptian history has been treated like an ill-favored stepchild. Scholars, with one or two exceptions, have treated it as an ancillary aspect of the Ottoman Empire or as a by-product of international relations. As a consequence, the basis for the history of the period has rested on two assumptions: first, that the period was one of chaos and anarchy, in which little happened of historical interest other than internecine Mamlūk feuds; and, second, that it was an era of intellectual decline when nothing innovative was written, only endless commentaries and glosses of medieval religious texts. Zabīdī and Jabartī, the two intellectual giants of the later part of the period, were invariably described as unique and *sui generis*. Since hardly a scholar had read any of the glosses and commentaries, although many had read Jabartī and Zabīdī, the second assumption seemed safe enough to make. Moreover, the authors of the *Déscription de l'Égypte*, the standard reference work in the West for the period, had reinforced that opinion of the low state of Egyptian intellectual life.

Recent scholarship has begun to change that image. Scholars have gone back to the indigenous primary sources for their material: to archives, to *al-mahkama*, *al-shari'a*, and *al-awqāf* documents, and to the commentaries and glosses of the time. The picture emerging from their efforts is a new and challenging one. André Raymond, in his masterly and brilliant work, *Artisans et commerçants au Caire au XVIII^{ème} siècle*, gave us our first economic history of eighteenth-century Egypt. Peter Gran in this volume presents us with an equally exciting but certainly more controversial approach. His work asks questions not heretofore raised in a work on the Near East, even though such questions form the methodological apparatus of Western historical research. More important, he suggests answers to these questions on the basis of research in the commentaries and glosses. He shows that these works, previously ignored and despised, reveal an active intellectual life that mirrored the changing economic conditions of the day—that internal forces were pushing the country toward a capitalist transformation long before the advent of the Western entrepreneur. The intellectual developments of the period likewise show that, far from being *sui generis* in one case and mediocre repetition in the other, what was happening was well within an age of intellectual revitalization and was rich in secular ideas and rationalist interpretations of the economic changes Egyptian society was undergoing.

† Peter Gran's hypothesis that the output of the 'ulamā' marked "developments in secular culture and were supportive of capitalism" is a challenge

to past scholarship. It is one based on a rational premise that, since something does not arise out of nothing, there must be a historical pattern of continuity and an integrated framework for studying Egypt that would allow us to find reasons for events in historical terms rather than to label them in meaningless terms like "chaos" and "anarchy." Gran's attempt to find a pattern in over a century of Egyptian history is a remarkable work of scholarship. It will stir up controversy but will also open the eyes of scholars of the period to a totally new perspective—from within that society—an achievement in itself.

Professor Afaf Lutfi Al-Sayyid Marsot
Department of History
University of California at Los Angeles

Preface

This study is based on extensive use of books and manuscripts in the al-Azhar mosque center and the Egyptian National Library (Dār al-Kutub). Since the major figures of the eighteenth century who are studied here were all *shaykhs* of al-Azhar, and those of the Muḥammad ‘Alī period were nearly all *shaykhs*, the library of al-Azhar was very useful.

The criteria for identifying trends in various fields and for characterizing historical periods were developed primarily from the biographical dictionaries covering the principal figures of each period, and from manuscript catalogs. From these two sources, the books which were written during each period and their distribution according to subject matter were identified. The excellent manuscript catalogs of al-Azhar and Dār al-Kutub were a major source for delineating the character of the eighteenth-century revival. These catalogs date not only the original writings of different eras but also the copies of standard works. The demand for copies of various works is a reasonable indicator of the general direction which studies took at any given time. Of particular importance in the study of eighteenth-century culture is the section of any manuscript catalog entitled “Muṣṭalaḥ al-ḥadīth” (literally, the technical terms of *ḥadīth* studies); this section includes material on the subjects taught by each *shaykh* in the form of minor works called *sanad*, *thabat*, *ijāza*, *fahrasa*, and so on. For Turkey and Syria in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, there are also outstanding biographical dictionaries and manuscript catalogs. For Damascus, there is the Zāhiriyya library catalog with its supplements; and for Istanbul, I used a card file located in Dār al-Kutub which lists the contents of the private libraries in Istanbul, about thirty in number. Researchers needing individual call numbers for these manuscripts should contact me through the publisher.

I use a modified Library of Congress transliteration system retaining, for example, the spelling chosen by Arabic authors who write in Western languages, simplifying the system with respect to the different *alifs*, not underlining diphthongs like *sh*, *dh*, *th*, and so forth. In other cases, I emphasize the spelling over sound, such as *Sūhāj* for *Sohaj* and *Raḥman* for *Raḥmān*, and drop the *h* used for *ta’ marbūṭa*. I Turkicize only for Turkish writers in Anatolia.

The production of this book has also been a memorable experience. By its nature, it required a very stout heart and a large organizational approach. I owe a great deal to the mobilizing efforts of my colleagues Paul English and Robert Fernea, and from the technical and logistical end Barbara Burnham, Kristin Koptiuch, Scott Lubeck, and Barbara Spielman. Without the

expertise of these latter, it is difficult to imagine how this would have come about.

This book was written over a long period of time and owes a great deal to people and institutions to whom I can scarcely do justice. Much of what I learned about Egyptian social history came from the seminars of the history department of 'Ayn Shams. Students and faculty there provided me with a critical and supportive atmosphere. The employees of the Ministry of Culture who work in the Manuscript Division of Dār al-Kutub and their counterparts in al-Azhar made great efforts to find and identify and explain points in manuscripts. Without the help of *shaykhs* and others who worked in these areas, it would have been difficult to proceed. My friend Aida Kershah helped me a great deal over several years while I was going through the corpus of Al-'Aṭṭār's writings. André Raymond through his numerous writings and in my meetings with him gave me much of the framework. I owe a great deal to the institutions which permitted an extended stay in Egypt, foremost among them the American Research Center in Egypt; the Department of State, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs; and the Arabic Studies Department of the American University in Cairo.

Among those who have read and commented on this manuscript in one stage or another are William Polk, Fazlur Rahman, Jaroslav Stetkevych, and Talal Asad. More recently I have received a number of very incisive suggestions from Rifaat Abou El-Hajj, who patiently helped me to tighten my argument and develop the framework of my ideas. I leave to last the mention of my wife, Judith Gran, and the two professors whose influence on this work the reader may see. Albert Hourani has encouraged my research since my student days. I thank him for this confidence in my work. Afaf Lutfi Al-Sayyid Marsot, unrivaled in her knowledge of Egyptian history, has given me enormous assistance over a long period of time. I want her to know how much I appreciate all her efforts. To Judith Gran I owe a great deal. She introduced me to social science and has had a great influence on my becoming a social historian. Her help in the elaboration of the argument over the last ten years, while it moved from dissertation to book, can scarcely be covered in a brief section of acknowledgments.

Introduction: Reflections on the Persistence of 1798 as a Watershed in the Writing of Egyptian History

Islamic Roots of Capitalism is a work of revisionist historiography challenging the continued use of 1798 as a watershed in Egyptian history.

As the reader would know, the year 1798 plays a pivotal role in the central paradigm that virtually organizes the field of modern history. 1798 is the year of the Napoleonic invasion of Egypt, when modern Europe for the first time openly and overtly came in contact on a large-scale with the Middle East. For the past several generations, historians in Europe and elsewhere have considered the year 1798 as significant in the general scheme of the "Rise of the West". Historians of the Middle East have identified 1798 as the point at which Egypt left its medieval past and joined the modern world.¹

During the past generation, however, a considerable amount of information about eighteenth-century Egypt appeared in scholarship both in Egypt and in other countries, calling into question whether 1798 was of such importance for Egypt's trajectory toward the modern world. *The Islamic Roots of Capitalism* added a good deal of this information. Recent work has added still more.

One would hope that the reissuing of the *Islamic Roots of Capitalism* would spur a paradigm shift, that scholars specialized in Egyptian history for example, would see the practical benefits of using 1760 as a watershed as opposed to 1798, and that practicality would dictate that scholars specialized in European history would rethink the relationship of the Enlightenment in Paris with that of Napoleon in the Mediterranean.

However, such a hope may or may not be a realistic one. The persistence of 1798 as an assumed watershed is something of an exception to any general rule. It has managed to survive for a long time even in the face of considerable criticism. The question one needs to ask is —why is this the case?

In this essay reintroducing the book, I make a new attempt to explain the persistence of 1798. I go about it by considering a series of possible reasons for 1798's persistence until I finally arrive at a hypothesis that might stand up were this a more sustained work. Along the way, I question whether such a change in paradigms would interfere with work going on in the wider field of Middle Eastern studies. Failing to find an indication that it would, I proceed to ask if perhaps the field of Middle Eastern studies is a captive of the philological craft approach on which it relies, and if so, would this explain its predilection for this type of continuity and rupture model. I

find some evidence pointing in this direction but no immediate explanation of why this is the case. Perhaps, then, there is no useful explanation on the level of culture per se, perhaps the explanation for the persistence of the paradigm is bound up with politics, i.e., bound up with the maintenance of various contemporary hegemonies. I examine this possibility, conclude it is likely to be the case, and make it my hypothesis. I then develop this hypothesis and use it to comment on the book's reception and use.

I wind up concluding 1798 and the "Rise of the West" as a more general paradigm seem to be absolutely essential to the logic of any successful Western democracy as well as to the logic of Egypt itself. The conclusion, at least to me, is a disturbing one. If it turns out to be a correct one, it deserves much more attention than can be given it here. It is not an everyday occurrence to find that structural logic stands in the way of a paradigm shift. Here, at best, space only allowed me to explore a couple of ramifications of what I found. I decided to consider the future.

Looking to the future, I asked myself first, what kinds of changes would need to take place in the Western democracies and in Egypt on the level of hegemony to allow for the 1798 paradigm to give way to one placing more weight on the pre-existing historical dynamics of Egypt? Second, from among the world's currently existing democracies can one discern examples or types which appear to be more advanced than others in terms of potentially being able to dispense with the 1798 paradigm? The second question appears much easier than the first. It can be answered in the affirmative.

If paradigm conflicts, hegemony issues, and concerns about the role of the historian are among *Islamic Roots's* deeper implications, what the book is and has been for most of its readers is a history of Egypt which makes some new claims. As such, the book stands as a contribution to the study of premodern history leading to the rise of the modern state. Like a very considerable number of such books about different countries, this one emphasizes the global as opposed to the purely English or European significance of the industrial revolution of the late eighteenth century. Again, like many other books in the field of social history, *Islāmic Roots* seeks to explain how class struggle drove rulers in this period to collude in new ways in order to retain power, gradually destroying or transforming their societies in the process.

This work differs from a number of such works on a world-scale in two somewhat accidental ways. First, it emphasizes the development of the culture which would enter the contemporary age of the nation state. And, second, it concludes in 1840, a generation before the modern state in Egypt actually gets formed, thus presupposing some knowledge on the part of the reader of this later twenty year period both in terms of politics and in terms of culture.

Now, looking back, I wish that I had at least summarized these twenty years in the book. For many a student today taking a course in Middle Eastern history, what is well-known about Egypt is that which begins in the later nineteenth century with the British occupation of 1879-1881. The

eighteenth century is essentially unknown; 1798 is not a controversial issue; Muḥammad 'Alī is dimly appreciated. 1840–1879, i.e., the years connecting this book to the British period, are also known but only quite hazily.

Perhaps, it would thus be useful to note that in these intervening years the major event was the Land Law implemented during the reign of Sa'īd in the 1850's. The implementation of this law led to a considerable growth of private property in land; it also led to a considerable sharpening of class conflict. (Here, one is tempted to draw comparisons between this law and the new land law destined to be implemented shortly in Egypt.) In any case, in the 1860's, the ruling class made up of large landowners responded to the rise of class conflict with a program of modernization, one favoring lower Egypt over Upper Egypt, thereby ushering in a new hegemony, one not unlike that of Italy's Risorgimento, a hegemony which was emerging in the same period.

For this program of modernization to progress, the North or "advanced" region, i.e., the Delta, needed an accessible form of language for utilitarian purposes such as mass education and journalism. From this vantage point in place and in time, it is easy enough to see the importance of the cultural revival of the previous century. The major figures of modern times—Huṣayn al-Marṣafī, 'Abd Allah Nadīm, Ibrāhīm al-Muwayliḥī, and Muḥammad 'Abduh—built on the lexicography of al-Zabīdī and on the attempts at simplification of the language inspired by Shaykh Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār and his students, who worked as journalists and translators, and who edited literary texts in the period covered in this book.

A figure whose career spanned the era of transition from the period on which this book concentrates, 1760–1840, up to the birth of the modern state in the 1860's is Rifā'a al-Taḥṭāwī. Al-Taḥṭāwī is well-known to students today because of the book he wrote about his visit to France. Al-Taḥṭāwī is also known as a disciple of al-'Aṭṭār's in the 1820's and as a modernizer in the 1860's. What has not been generally realized—and this is a contribution of *Islamic Roots*—is how much of his progressive intellectual outlook came from his background in Egypt. Heretofore most scholars have attributed his reformism to the influence of his visit to France. Had 1798 not had to loom as such a central issue, the figure of al-Taḥṭāwī might have been made more central and this would have opened the book to a wider readership among history students.

A similar expression of regret could be made to the student coming from the field of modern Arabic literature who will read this book. Until recently, not much weight has been given to the subsequent impact of the Arabic writings of the first half of the nineteenth century. Thus it would be natural for a student to pick up this book believing that the modern renaissance involving a revival of classical Arabic literature and an adaptation of Western models of writing began in the second half of the century. I show that this so-called neoclassical period actually began in the late eighteenth century and that even the counter-impulse toward linguistic simplification and utilitarianism, also associated with the late nineteenth century, actu-

ally began at that time as well. In short, when one reached the age of the modern state in the second half of the nineteenth century and Italy had its Manzoni, Egypt had its Shawqī and Bārūdī, and neoclassicism was triumphant, there had already been a long period of gestation.

Finally had this been a book on Italy, I doubt if much attention would have been paid to it because the origins of modern culture have long been covered by earlier writers. For Egyptian studies, however, not only was and is the book "new," but, for reasons we will explore, it remains controversial. At one extreme *Islamic Roots* upset the conservative side of the orientalist tradition, while at the other extreme, it was rather too appealing to the Egyptian intellectual public—a point that became even more apparent after an Arabic translation of it appeared in 1990. In between these two poles, the book secured a nervous endorsement from many Western reviewers, who took from it details they found appealing.

In 1979 when it appeared in English, the field of late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Egyptian history in the Western countries was under the thrall of the post-World War Two Developmentalist Revolution in social thought far more than is the case today. This was still the heyday of modernization theory. At that time in any standard treatment, a very stagnant and very "Turkish" eighteenth century was replaced by a very progressive and increasingly Arab and European nineteenth century following the "Coming of the West," or Napoleon, in 1798.

By such standards—and even by those which prevail today—the book was and remains revisionist, especially in its argument that modern Egypt emerged out of its own internal dynamic in the context of the world market, ethnicity playing a rather lesser role. Typically, the agent of historical change is the West. The West usually is represented, as was noted before, by the arrival of Napoleon and his army in 1798. Here a comparison of the historiography of Egypt to that of Italy or of Spain is instructive as Napoleon invaded those countries as well and at about the same time. The traditional historiography on which I grew up claimed that Napoleon introduced both the bourgeois revolution and progress to all three countries. For these feats, he was generally appreciated, except that he was ill-received by ungrateful Spanish peasants. The larger point, however, was that Napoleon's invasions spread the bourgeois revolution out of France. That was the way I was taught in the 1960's. By the 1980's, with the growth of social history, historiography had become quite different. In the case of Spain, historians argued that the Spanish people rose and resisted French imperialism. The role of Napoleon was appreciably diminished. For Egypt, however, there has not been a comparable change in historiography, although there is a strikingly similar fact-picture. Thus we find, when it comes to the celebration of the bicentennial of the Napoleonic Invasion of Egypt planned for 1998, the theme to be celebrated is that of the French initiative in modernizing Egypt from 1798–1880, 1880 being the date at which, presumably, the British took over the task of modernizing Egypt. It does not appear that the Egyptian contribution to Egypt will be part of the celebrations. In the United States,

the festivities have already begun. In May 1987 the University of California at Los Angeles sponsored a conference along these same lines.

The point I am trying to establish here is not that there is not a French role in Egyptian history but rather that there still is a quasi-official backing for an academic paradigm for the study of Egypt, which while glorifying France falsifies Egyptian history. And this paradigm is alive and well, not just in France, but throughout the rest of the world, including Egypt. Any typical researcher up until today writing on what is called the Ottoman period of Egyptian history will end his or her book in 1798 without looking ahead. Any typical researcher on the modern period begins with 1798, or shortly thereafter, and rarely looks back. Both sets of writers presuppose the same thing—namely that the eighteenth century, for diverse reasons, was a period which has no important connection to the nineteenth century. For most this is “explained” in terms of the mysterious *ur-concept* decline. Egypt’s decline is portrayed as one from which there was no recovery. This decline was like no other decline ever experienced in other countries; it could only be remedied through foreign intervention.

Scholarship is not propaganda; at least, a linkage between the two can not be made in any simple sense. Furthermore, the maintenance of the 1798 paradigm is the work of scholars of many nationalities, including Egyptians, and this certainly adds some interest to the subject.

What are historians thinking? Why not sample some of the best-known examples of the scholarship and see what inferences can be drawn from it? For the eighteenth century, the most influential scholar of recent years is the French economic historian André Raymond. In Raymond’s principal work, *Artisans et Commerçants au Caire au XVIII^e Siècle* (Damascus: IFAO, 1973-4), one of the author’s major points about the late eighteenth century concerns the shrinking of the Egyptian middle and upper classes, a reaching of the end. Raymond draws a parallel in this way to the political history of the same period which stresses a rising chaos, reaching conclusions in both cases which imply a kind of dead-end hopelessness.

By way of contrast, the present work substitutes the notion of change for that of decline. It finds that the eighteenth century was a period of fairly rapid change. In economic terms, different groups were gaining wealth and power. The dominant personalities sensing the new economic possibilities arising from export agriculture during this period fought each other to gain control of these resources.

Rather than see the Ottoman period as a unit of decline, or the eighteenth century as a period of decline, as previous writers have, I argue that it makes more sense to see the middle of the eighteenth century as a distinct point at which the modern world capitalist economy in formation and the Egyptian economy with its own capitalism began to intersect, reinforcing each other. At this point as well, on a political level, ‘Alī Bey al-Kabīr, the Egyptian ruler, attempted to gain political independence for the country.

Why has this not been seized on by the field? The facts I allude to about ‘Alī Bey have been known for a generation. What holds the dominant para-

digm in place, precluding historians from spelling out the indigenous trajectory toward a modern political economy for Egypt as they have for Italy and Spain? Why is the Egyptian field still content to wait on Napoleon?

An analogous question arises for the area of eighteenth-century cultural history. Defenders of the dominant paradigm argue that the two great figures of late eighteenth-century Egypt—the historian al-Jabartī and the lexicographer al-Zabīdī—were geniuses in a dark age. The reception on the part of upholders of this paradigm to my presentation of details of a third figure, Shaykh Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār (1766–1835), was true to form. Most reviewers wanted to make him another genius in the same dark age.

Most reviewers seemed pleased to find another such genius. A few reviewers formed a negative impression and appeared to recognize more or less clearly that the book did not simply present information about some new personality, but also presented an argument for a new paradigm to study the period as a whole. Why claim the existence of a cultural revival in the eighteenth century? There might have been more writing in the seventeenth century, one reviewer, the Israeli historian Gabriel Baer, suggested. Fred De Jong, a Dutch orientalist, took yet another tack, inquiring how anyone could think that an ʿĀlim's work (the scholarship of a cleric) could have secular cultural implications. An ʿĀlim produces religious texts. De Jong thus concluded that religious organizations would therefore not have anything to do with secular culture, and hence my argument linking the neoclassicism of the nineteenth century with eighteenth-century antecedents was ill founded (see *A Note on Critical Reception*).

While De Jong took the most extreme stance, he was not alone in commenting on how unexpected it was to find the two periods linked together. Some reviewers seemed to assume that the eighteenth and nineteenth century were so far apart that they could not be connected. Other reviewers disagreed over how one should read al-ʿAṭṭār's writing, possibly disturbed by its modernity. De Jong, whom I mentioned before as an upholder of the dominant paradigm, appears convinced that what al-ʿAṭṭār evoked in his poetry was simply time-worn spiritual imagery, never anything materially real from al-ʿAṭṭār's own life.

While this is no doubt a specialized book, as the reader may be becoming aware, the assumptions on which it is based are those found in social history generally, and students I have taught have found they could follow the arguments. Al-ʿAṭṭār wrote about what mattered to him. When he travelled, he did so because he had a reason to. Al-ʿAṭṭār, like others through human history, chose for example where he travelled in order to get a good education. Operating with such an assumption in Middle East studies, one is likely to run up against the orientalist assumption that *ʿUlamā* do not act like us because they are not like us, a point made by orientalists in many different ways. In addition, al-ʿAṭṭār would not have travelled for educational reasons because each mosque center was, in principle, a self-sufficient, interchangeable entity—Cairo was the same as Istanbul, so no travel was required. It is further assumed that by the eighteenth century

mosques everywhere were passing on totally derivative knowledge, largely through rote memory. Thus the idea of al-‘Aṭṭār as a modernizer cannot be explained by his travel to different mosques.

Here there is more than a bit of a disagreement between paradigms. I assumed that the diversity of the Middle East/Mediterranean region was something one could take as a given. Juxtaposed next to each other in this region, one finds, as one has always found, radically different cultural contexts. Thus, at any given time one can speak of a *de facto* division of labor in culture and of a tradition of travel and study which characterize this region. In the eighteenth century, Cairo was strong in language study approached as transmitted science, Damascus was strong in holistic thought through Sufism, and Istanbul was strong in the natural sciences, specifically in fields emerging out of Aristotelian labelling into positivism, e.g., medicine.

Part of the richness of the Mediterranean comes from the fact that rarely did any one trend totally dominate the others; this fact explains for all periods why one finds a lively expression of difference of views. Researchers in the dominant paradigm err, I believe, in dismissing the Egyptian connection to this Mediterranean environment.

How then would a social historian look at the period 1760–1800 or make sense of the transition from the eighteenth century to what we today call the reform period of the first third of the nineteenth century? I postulate that the eighteenth-century cultural movement in Egypt was like that of its contemporary, the Spanish Enlightenment. Both movements were a prefiguration of the more capitalist culture of the late nineteenth century to come, both took the form of a neoclassical revival. In the case of Egypt, as the eighteenth century came to an end this revival moved increasingly away from *ḥadīth* (tradition literature) study based in a simple empiricism toward a kind of deductive metaphysical rationalism more heavily rooted in *fiqh* (theology).

Where the French Enlightenment asserted man's reason as triumphant over all tradition, all faith, and all things past, the Spanish and Egyptian Enlightenments looked to the scholastic past to find a way to create some balance between the individual and society and between faith and reason in a changing age. One side of this cultural trend grew to become romantic and neoclassical, given to a rediscovery of the past as a way to find answers. The other side of this neoclassicism embodied the seeds of modern positivism.

Following the example of other writers on the eighteenth century, who deal with enlightenment culture in the latin world, this book tries to sketch out a linkage between the evolution of a Spanish-style enlightenment and the various changes in the Egyptian social structure before and after 1815. In the late eighteenth century, the center of gravity of cultural production was in the mercantile middle strata. After 1815 wealth and cultural patronage for the Egyptian people narrowed, becoming heavily concentrated in a state-centered apparatus based on a landlord class in formation; commerce

was controlled by minority communities. *Islamic Roots* presents some general points about this process as well as some specific information about the individuals who lived in these periods.

Al-ʿAṭṭār's life is especially of use for the study of the period covered in this book. Al-ʿAṭṭār was a keen observer. For example, he was aware of the problem of the cultural narrowing occurring in the so-called Reform Period in Egypt after 1815. Quotations from his writings of this time show how, despite the eminence he achieved, al-ʿAṭṭār paid a high price for fame in terms of intellectual alienation. By 1815, al-ʿAṭṭār had come to hate the Azhar for its unintellectual nature compared to what it had been in his youth. He had to be very careful. Hence one finds a comment on the need for the empirical study of anatomy enmeshed in a work rooted in deductive logic.

As those who are fairly specialized know, the Muḥammad ʿAlī period is certainly a much written about period. Still, what is apparent when one picks up the standard books is really very little, little more than a difference of opinion among authors on the nature of Muḥammad ʿAlī as a ruler and as a person. Although interesting and sometimes well-informed, these works do not push the field forward. What is lacking in them is a sense of the broader paradigm conflict one would expect to find in the study of another country. In Egyptian studies, one finds a general acceptance of the "great man" theory of history; the majority of writers seems to agree that Muḥammad ʿAlī was the founder of modern Egypt and that his reforms were those which created the modern country. My claim that he was part of a ruling class that played a transitional role sandwiched in between ʿAlī Bey and Khedive Ismaʿīl in the 1860's and that he was a figure whose reforms need therefore to be rethought and put in a new light by historians is revisionist.

Yet, what is obvious also is that the information on which I base my revisionism is information which is very much in the public domain. Read a book or two on the Pasha and it becomes clear that the Reform Period was neither the beginning nor the end of anything. For the majority of Egyptians who lived through the Reform Period, and not just for Shaykh Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār, life probably became more difficult than it had been in the eighteenth century. For one thing, the impact of France on Egypt in the early nineteenth century combined with the machinations of the Egyptian ruling class of the period resulted in a growing uneven distribution of wealth. Modernization, in the sense of improved personal well-being, occurred for a small number, many of whom were minorities or expatriate Europeans living in Egypt. Therefore, the claim that France contributed to the modernization of Egypt, followed by Great Britain and the United States is a theme that the field of Middle East studies needs to revisit. For the interested reader, the long debate on the deindustrialization of India in the nineteenth century could serve as a point of departure.

Even in the 1970's when I wrote this book, however revisionist it was, I was never alone in any absolute sense. A number of colleagues were coming

up with findings which jibed with mine. In fact, information contradicting the dominant paradigm was constantly appearing. I still recall Afaf Marsot's early articles on reform-minded '*ulama*', and Jamāl al-Dīn al-Shayyāl's study of eighteenth-century culture (citations appear in the bibliography), works which suggested to me that the dominant interpretation of culture might not suffice. Likewise, in matters of the economy, even where most books emphasize stagnation in the eighteenth century, one could find in the work of André Raymond—and some did—a different picture, one showing not only an economically strong country but one—as I indicated above—marked by considerable struggles over who was to control the wealth. During the 1970's, the field of political history also began to undergo some change in the writings of Daniel Crecelius and others, who brought to light information suggesting the formative role for the development of modern Egypt of 'Alī Bey al-Kabīr, the mid-eighteenth-century ruler I mentioned above. Eventually the weight of this new information began to put some pressure on the standard picture of the 1798 paradigm. The eighteenth century could no longer be presented as a dark age. Rather it was, as the literary critic Sabry Hafez put it more recently in a quite daring work, the genesis of modern literary culture.²

In fact the closer one moves to our own day, the more one finds a visceral awareness of the limitations of the "rise and decline" approach to Middle Eastern history specifically and to eurocentrism more generally on the part of each new generation of researchers entering the field of modern Middle Eastern studies. Recent authors in this general domain include the historian Ken Cuno, author of a work on the land system, and Layla 'Inān, the literary critic. Cuno's study shows continuity from the eighteenth to the nineteenth century. 'Inān's study questions whether the French official sources reflected what the French actually believed in 1798, or in other words, were the official sources simply committed to denigrating Egypt for reasons of state. In addition to these two works, one even finds works based on Ottoman materials, for a long time the bastion of the older paradigm, expressing new ideas. Jane Hathaway's recent book covering eighteenth-century Egypt concludes by praising the possibility of new interpretations. In his most recent book, the established writer of the previous generation, André Raymond, shows an eighteenth-century renaissance in architectural work in Cairo. Finally, in her most recent book, Afaf Marsot, the other major figure of the previous generation, depicts the life of women in eighteenth-century Egypt as freer than that of their counterparts in the nineteenth century, another implicit blow at modernization theory and at the dominant paradigm more generally.³ Such works as these represent a considerable development. The question remains: Why then do we still find the dominant paradigm upholding 1798 and the idea of the "Coming of the West" largely intact?

This point seems to me to be of obvious importance; I hope it will interest students in this field more than it has up to now and that it will become the subject of future inquiries.

Perhaps to bring about a paradigm shift what one needs is not just change in one field but in several adjacent fields at the same time. For there to be change on the level of a paradigm shift concerning Napoleon's invasion of Egypt in 1798, changes would need to occur in fields abutting on, and affected by, the study of eighteenth-century Egyptian history, changes that would make room for this paradigm change. If such changes did not occur, then perhaps a paradigm shift would be delayed. However, according to my reading of these fields, such changes have occurred. Both the study of the Ottoman Empire and of modern Egyptian history have undergone considerable changes in this past quarter century.

For example, in an influential book on Ottoman history, the historian, Rifa' at 'Alī Abou-El-Haj argued against the use of the model of the rise and decline of the Ottoman Empire. This model, he suggests, serves less the needs of Ottoman studies than those of European studies. In his view, one could imagine the traditional Ottoman Empire paradigm was conceived to provide some sort of an archaic backdrop for the rise of a progressive Europe. Other scholars from around the Mediterranean have questioned the degree to which the Mediterranean purportedly declined as a trade or culture area simply because the North Atlantic grew in importance. For example, in a work now in press, the historian Nelly Hanna shows the long-term power of the middle strata of seventeenth-century Cairo in commerce and society. If one upholds the old paradigm, this continuity of power would be impossible. While the existence of Hanna's work and that of others logically strengthens the claims of this book, the continuing prestige of 1798 as a watershed can scarcely be doubted.⁴

Change is what one also finds when one turns to a consideration of the scholarship on modern Egypt. In recent years, scholarship on modern Egypt has gradually broadened to include increasingly an acceptance of the idea of the modernity of the indigenous in areas ranging from law and language to religion. It is now even possible to write, as Amira Sonbol has, about the modernity of Egyptian medicine and of the rather reactionary practices brought by the British to medicine in Egypt in the late nineteenth century. Such writing draws attention by implication to the formative influence of the early modern period and to what is indigenous, yet, for whatever reasons, it appears to do so without affecting the 1798 paradigm.⁵

In the past five years especially, other changes have been occurring across the sub-specializations of the field. The influence of Islamism and of post-modernism have begun to be apparent. Not surprisingly, one finds writers in these sub-specializations are critical of at least some parts of the dominant paradigm. For example, for many Islamists, the eighteenth century is important because of Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Al-Wahhāb. For others, the Ottoman presence in Egypt was a more legitimate one than the nationalist presence which replaced it. For the postmodernists, the emphasis is more on the arbitrary nature and constructedness of the modern state. Historians, such as Khaled Fahmy, reflect on the disciplinary practices of the army of Muḥammad 'Alī, as do political scientists like Timothy Mitchell. Still, one does not find any serious challenge to the 1798 paradigm.⁶

Why then the continuing prestige of this paradigm and of the European tutelage approach to understanding Egyptian modernization? Apparently, more than new findings in knowledge are needed to generate a paradigm shift—at least in this case. Let us take this consideration a step further and reflect on the possible role that methodology and craft may be playing in the maintenance of the 1798 paradigm.

Upon reflection, it appears that methodology is not an area of the field in which one hears much about challenge or change. The dominant methodology is philology. Language specialists, trained as philologists, editing texts, writing dictionaries, and producing translations are the arbiters of the field—not only for language but even for history. The state turns to philologists for its language policy. There is no one challenging them, and this has been the case since the nineteenth century. There is no anti-state, anti-philological trend of critical writing. Of course, one need not be a philologist oneself or even try to emulate one; one can be a social scientist and totally ignore language. This does not change anything.

For philologists, what one thinks can be broken down into words; each word has a discrete meaning, the sum of the words equals the sum of the meaning. Discrete words retain relative continuity of meaning, at least in Semitic languages such as Arabic, over a long period of time. In contrast to historical linguistics or to history itself, to philology change is a virtual outsider. It is something which has to be explained. Philology places great weight on the idea of authoritative texts and of authoritative translations. Such texts stabilize and canonize meaning providing a normative basis of continuity. This stability is the primary goal of a philologist; how people actually speak or read or understand is less important.

Historically, philology has had its greatest successes in the beginning of various fields and in fields such as the studies of antiquity, where there are few sources, or in biblical studies, where the sacred nature of the text is a factor. In other contexts, as fields developed, the number of sources began to multiply and other ways could be established to evaluate what a writer may have meant; philology having played its role, generally retired. Over the past century, one can trace a rise and decline of philology in many areas on some such basis. What stands out here, by way of contrast, is a continuing philological hegemony in a branch of knowledge, notably that of the modern Middle East, which now has quite a repertoire of sources to work from.

This raises questions of an interesting sort. As knowledge about the Middle East grew, why were the scholars of this area still unable or unwilling to fend for themselves in terms of language and meaning? Why did they keep deferring to philology?

More disturbingly, if a small group of Middle East specialists was somehow mesmerized by philology, why were they not brought to their senses years ago by collegial criticism from around the academy? All manner of fields have thrown off the shackles of philology; many a living scholar could easily relate some piece of this larger picture. Yet, to my knowledge, there has never been any sustained attempt from outside (much less from inside)

to change matters. One hears the occasional critique of an orientalist perspective but nothing sustained and methodological in terms of what underlies this perspective.

Yet, one can easily enough imagine the field of Egyptian studies without philology. It would be a field that chose to adopt an approach to language based on context or on use as opposed to on classical authority. This would be a very major change, but it would not be something out of the ordinary for a historian.

Here a point of clarification is in order. A common mistaken view I need to dispel to proceed with this discussion is that philology is a field which presupposes the centrality of language and is, therefore, part and parcel of language study in the academy. Based on my experiences dealing with the issue of the 1798 paradigm, this does not appear to be the case. What philologists appear to be concerned with is authority and power through language not language per se. How most people speak, how they read, and what they understand are dismissed by philologists as a problem called *diglossia*. One might thus deduce—and I think this is true—that history based on philology inherits these limitations. The peasantry of the Ottoman Empire were the sheep, one of my teachers used to say. For me this was outrageous, yet from the point of view of philology, he was correct.

History studied as philology is not really history. This absence of true history may explain the maintenance of a failed paradigm like that of 1798. If the ordinary historian is oriented to advances in the discipline of history on a world scale, the historian trained as a philologist is not. He or she remains encased inside a particular language, or language group, like Semitics. As such, his or her relation to history is uncertain. Put the other way round, the role philologists play is one that emphasizes continuity over change and one that emphasizes the unique and oriental over the general and the human.

Can philology be resisted? Is capitulation the only way to survive in the modern academy? This is not clear; what does seem clear, however, is that in the last thirty years, most of the professors of Middle Eastern studies whose names would be recognizable in the wider circles of Western culture made their mark by capitulating, by articulating the logic of philology, and by expressing how unique Islam and the Middle East are in some general forum. This was true for Gustave von Grunebaum and for Bernard Lewis. More recently, it is true for Ernest Gellner, Clifford Geertz, and Pierre Bourdieu. Coming from an entirely different background, even Edward Said had to frame his issues in terms of "Orient" and "Non-Orient."

Thus far then the reasons for the persistence of the 1798 paradigm remain unclear. Why does the researcher in the trenches regardless of background retain a periodization, even a methodology, which obscures his or her finding? Why does the culture at large court personalities from the field who exemplify these distortions? Can these problems be laid, if not to philology, then to problems of sources? It does not seem that simple, but it is worth considering.

Since the 1970's, the overwhelming majority of researchers have identified the best sources for their work as archival ones. For a few this involved reading wills, for many more it meant reading land records or court records. These are supplemented for some by dossiers on the lives of government officials.

Needless to say, there are craft-related problems inherent in this archival study. Where an American student being trained to study the United States or Europe is encouraged to immerse him or herself in the local culture, to know the material found in the libraries of the region being studied, and to have a relationship with local scholars, this has not been the practice for American students going to Egypt. They are by themselves. Few really speak Arabic, or care to. Their daily routine is the archive. But what does one do in an archive of a country whose culture one does not understand and whose people one does not know? In general, I believe, the typical student becomes increasingly apprehensive as time passes and modifies his or her topic to fit what he or she comes across. The material comes to define the dissertation topic. Under such working conditions, larger concerns such as paradigms scarcely arise. So, yes, sources are a problem. Why they are allowed to be a problem of this sort by the professoriat cannot be so easily explained. One certainly cannot blame the students.

One small piece of this problem is the belief held not just by philologists but by most historians that working in archives permits one to resolve problems while reading the existing books (especially literary books) leads nowhere. This seems a bit odd. On the one hand, little ever gets "resolved" whatever one does in any field. On the other hand, the principal form of written expression in Egypt is literary expression. Thousands of books of a literary sort discussing virtually every imaginable subject past and present exist in Egypt as they exist in any "Italian Road" state. (For a discussion of "Italian Road" states and their cultures see my book, *Beyond Eurocentrism*.) However, just as our modern scholars avoid contact with their Egyptian counterparts by not learning to speak their language, so too they avoid this cumulative tradition of learning available in the country itself by not encountering it. The student will tell you that he or she is a social historian. From this one is supposed to understand that only an intellectual historian would use literary sources and that intellectual history is passé.

Politics and Hegemonies

Our inquiry about why the date 1798 persists as a watershed in the writing of Egyptian history began with a consideration of facts, which reason suggests should have induced a paradigm shift. Failing to find an answer on this level, the inquiry continued, taking up a consideration of methodology. Here it was noted that for whatever reasons, philology still persists. Information about philology was presented; the general conclusion drawn from this information was that philology works against paradigm shifts, that it

is aligned to the traditional orientalist paradigm of 1798. There was some indication that sources play a role. The inquiry then proceeded to the level of a limited social analysis. Did the larger society show signs of impatience or irritation with the writings on Egypt carried out through the dominant paradigm? Little evidence of such impatience or irritation was found. The questions thus remain. Why 1798? Why does philology continue; why is it not attacked? Why does not a profession such as social history or historical sociology, which has much to lose from claims of exceptionalism, come down on orientalists as saboteurs of the development of the human sciences? Why has not such an academic turf war manifested itself even once? Finally, why generation after generation do students in the Western countries choose to study a country whose people interest them so little that they do not care to learn the country's living language only that of its texts.

If no answers present themselves on the level of intellectual discourse, logically then one must look beyond this level to the level of the societal logic underpinning these various discourses. What do we know about the forms of modern hegemonies and of their need for certain paradigms? In this last part of the essay, an attempt is made to explain on this macrolevel what could not be so easily explained on the level of facts about Egypt, of choices of methodologies and sources. In so doing, I will draw on what I wrote in *Beyond Eurocentrism* (Syracuse University Press, 1996) about hegemonic logics. Here, finally, some strong hypotheses appear.

To clearly develop these hypotheses the term "hegemonic logic" needs to be well understood. First of all, I am not referring to Middle East oil or oil policy. Philologists do not serve oil companies. Their obscurantism may make the Middle East inaccessible to the Western public and thus may help cover up some oil diplomacy, but this result is incidental. Oil companies are rather hated as "fat cats" even in Middle East studies; little support could be garnered in the field for a war to protect an oil company. The explanation for the great success of oil company politics in the Middle East, given their bad image, must lie elsewhere.

The manufacture of hegemony, or of hegemonic logic, implies an approach to explaining how a country, such as the United States, is ruled. A country is ruled not only by force but by persuasion; rule by persuasion requires an organization of culture. This organization of culture includes an organization of cultural myths, myths such as the myth of origin and the myth of holy lands. For Americans and other Westerners, the Middle East plays a key role in both the myth of origin and in that of holy land. The Middle East is the cultural basis of everything that comes later; it cannot change, rather it must manifest continuity—shedding light, perhaps, on why philologists are so persuasive. Who else as effectively as philologists can argue that Arabic flows from Hebrew, Aramaic, and other languages dating from Adam and Eve?

Would not then philologists be good candidates for state intellectuals? Do they not provide the needed support for our myth that the West began in the ancient Middle East and as a result that the West has a special

originary claim to it because Westerners became God's chosen people there? Without wanting to overstate the myth, let me suggest that much of Western "common sense" right up to now follows from these assumptions.

First is the assumption that the ancient Middle East is the important Middle East; how one interprets the Middle East in any other period should reflect that fact. This point will loom large in what follows. Second, in recent centuries, the Middle East has seen the arrival of interlopers, such as Arabs and Turks. Third, these interlopers will eventually have to be disposed of to make way for the return of God which will mark the end of human history and the birth of a new stage. Fourth, the birth of Israel in 1948 appears to mark a part of this transition, presenting a successful reentry of the West into the Middle East after thousands of years filled with unsuccessful crusades and unsuccessful colonialism. The fifth and final drama depicts the takeover of the whole Middle East from the Arabs and the Turks and the conversion of the Israelis to Christianity. This is the deep structure of the myth inside the dominant paradigm.

For Middle Easterners, at least for the dominant classes and their intellectuals, there is also an attraction to these elements of the dominant paradigm and to philology, despite differences on the level of the organization of culture. Do, then, the Middle Eastern elite identify with the "Rise of the West" paradigm? Indeed, they do. Actually, they exploit the paradigm quite nicely, claiming that they are their society's main link with the West and therefore with progress. In addition, they have their own reasons for giving philology a privileged position. Among these reasons is the need to control the definition of what is the real language.⁷

Thus one finds for reasons internal to Western and to Middle Eastern ruling-class culture, a defense of a certain view of history and of language. This defense takes precedence over what one could otherwise term, in the abstract, the needs of linguists, historians, and other intellectuals. This means—here to give another interpretation of the careers of Von Grunbaum, Bernard Lewis, et al.—that a few intellectuals actually parade these ideas in their public thought and the regime gives them a chance to do so and to do so conspicuously. One could term these the "regime intellectuals"; their function is to constrain others from openly contesting the positions they are espousing. The latter through their silence are marginalized; they become "technicians." Only a few scholars are likely to mount any kind of challenge to the ruling class and they are manageable. In these past few lines a new dimension has been explicitly added to the discussion, the dimension of power. Power explains a great deal about history-writing and language. While its rôle can be overstated, more commonly it is understated. Here it certainly helps to explain the enigma we have been discussing, that of the birth and persistence of the 1798 paradigm.⁸

In *Islamic Roots* I develop some examples of the constraints placed on intellectuals by a hegemony to help illustrate the birth of "1798." Al-Jabarti, the historian and the major source for the study of the late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century period, completed his principal

work under the auspices of Muḥammad 'Alī. Multi-volume histories are not written without patrons. This fact becomes especially evident in the last volume when al-Jabartī downplays the amount of existing social change and havoc (a theme he dwelt on earlier) and downplays as well his nostalgia for the days of the well-run Mamluk household (or Bayt). What al-Jabartī could write reflected the power and purse of his patron. Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār, the protagonist of *Islamic Roots*, clearly crafted what he wrote about his contacts with the French in his *Maqāma* to avoid political ostracism. If one reads what he wrote without reference to his context, one would imagine his *Maqāma* a literary fantasy. In short, when one investigates what was happening in 1798 and why it is presented in the way it is, the factor of hegemony turns out not only to be a contemporary issue but one going back to the period in question. Thought was controlled then; it is controlled today.

In fact, the hypothesis of a hegemonic organization of culture explains our "views" on many matters, even fairly recent ones. Court poets of the later Middle Ages write in *saḥ* (insincere rhymed-verse) because first, they are mediocrities and second, they are simply writing for money. None of it is on the level of the 'Abbāsīd court poetry, which represents the Golden Age. Such is the way that the dominant paradigm clears the ground for its own explanation of the rise of modern Arabic poetry in the late nineteenth century through neoclassicism and emulation of the West. By making fun of these poets, one can ignore questions of power or of struggle. There is yet to be a book that studies early modern Arabic culture from within, or even one that acknowledges the reality that writing a poem is work and that the poet needs to write a lot of poetry to feed his children. If over time, the court poets of Ottoman Egypt could simplify the production of the product for which they were paid, it was these later ones with their *saḥ* who warrant some attention especially from social historians. Are the writers of *saḥ* mediocre and insincere or are they shrewder than the earlier hard-working ones like Jāhiz? Isn't something like this suggested by 'Abd al-Raḥīm 'Abd al-Raḥmān 'Abd al-Raḥīm's study of a particular seventeenth-century work, *Hazz al-Quhūf*? As 'Abd al-Raḥīm shows, *saḥ*—so often associated with insincerity—can, under certain conditions, equally express a biting social realism. It is thus less the linguistic form of *saḥ*, or the quality of the poet (as most scholars believe), or the so-called "genius in a dark age," than it is the social context and commitments of the poets themselves that explain what is written, and for us all this is made invisible by our organization of culture.

As with *saḥ*, so too with scholastic writing more generally. Our dominant paradigm takes the production of scholastic work to be indicative of the backwardness of the writer, if not of the society that produces the writer. It is thus commonly believed both by Western orientalists and by many intellectuals in the Middle East even today that eighteenth-century literature is almost by definition less original than its antecedents. Needless to say, this belief is just that; a belief not grounded in research that might

justify it, because the period from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century remains largely unstudied. It is rather a necessary assumption that what is older must be purer, closer to the "Golden Age." Hegemony so dictates.

And, if hegemony remains unchallenged, it is internalized and becomes habit. The dominant paradigm of the "Rise of the West" is so internalized that choices made by university professors doing historical research appear often virtually automatic, as if they were habits. For example, in the same University of London (or Oxford or Cambridge) where one finds a Peter Holt writing on the political chaos of eighteenth-century Egypt and relying on assumptions (such as those we have been discussing), one finds a Pocock or a Namier writing on the United Kingdom. Each follows his own tradition. Eighteenth-century Britain is part of the "Rise of the West." However similar the material may be to that of eighteenth century Egypt, it has to be dealt with quite differently.

Where a scholar in British history would take an eighteenth-century commentary on an older British writer as a part of eighteenth-century culture and therefore as possibly something new, scholars in Egyptian studies have, by and large, chosen not to adopt such an approach. The latter's preference has been to assume that if an Egyptian author wrote a commentary he composed his work to help in his teaching, hence there would be nothing new.

Yet, in both England and Egypt this same eighteenth century was the great age of the polymath, of the letter-writer, and of the writers who marked the transition toward the novel. Why then the difference in approach? If one were to return to the world of ideas of the first half of this essay, one might now suppose that the English have no concern for tradition or continuity, that they applaud the virtues of the eighteenth century because nothing went before it. On closer examination, one finds nothing could be farther from the case. The English fetishize tradition, and they have plenty to fetishize. The Whig view of history tyrannizes over them, yet not to the point where an English scholar is prevented from finding something new in an eighteenth-century commentary.

What one is left with is the need to postulate that, within the shared cultural grid linking the hegemonic elements of the modern nation states, both Egypt and England would automatically stress difference over similarity. What applies to the one does not apply to the other. There is no conspiracy, as everyone—given certain power relations—reaches these conclusions for themselves. If medieval Christianity gave rise to modern culture, and this can be shown from the work of various historians of religion, such as Tawney, Weber, Troelsch and others, then a writer, such as Maxime Rodinson, Samir Amin, or myself ought not to approach the Middle East in the same manner. If they do, this is controversial or revisionist. Modernity is supposed to come to the Middle East from the West and not from developments within the Middle East itself.

Compared to the works of Samir Amin and Maxime Rodinson, *Islamic Roots of Capitalism* is a fairly modest book. It aspires to bring about a

paradigm shift simply from facts and details about Egypt between 1760–1840. It does not take on philology and orientalism as methodological problems nor does it provide, as *Beyond Eurocentrism* does, a more complicated theoretical explanation for paradigms as part of power structures. Looking back at *Islamic Roots* after twenty years, I only really regret that in certain respects, I followed the dominant paradigm too much and attributed too much historical agency to the state and to the urban middle classes at the expense of the rural mass population and of the urban slums. The unreasonableness of this was not apparent at the time of my writing. One reaches such conclusions by stepping back and observing how historians in Brazil, Mexico, India, Russia, China, and Sub-Saharan Africa, Italy, and other countries manage to confront the problem of social dynamics. In these countries, writers establish something of a balance between the urban and the rural parts of the social dynamic while for the Middle East this has not been the case. As a result, I think the book should be seen as something to build on. It starts out in the right direction. It recognizes that change comes about through the playing out of the indigenous dynamic. Outside elements intrude, but what is decisive for most people is the internal struggle of ruler and ruled. Given the scarcity of this type of work in Middle East studies, *Islamic Roots* still has a function.

On the level of detail, some of the book's main contributions come from its insights about the middle strata of Egypt. This middle strata underwent a terrible and painful involution as capitalism grew and as the hegemonic strategy changed in the years between the 1780's and the 1830's. Al-Jabartī, the historian, gave many short but poignant accounts of the middle strata's resistance and then of its despair. In the 1830's, the English traveller, Edward W. Lane, took the wild despairing behavior of the popular Ṣūfī groups as a norm, not understanding that their behavior was a part of the death throes of their class. While Lane's interpretation was wrong, his description stands, and I drew on what he and al-Jabartī had to offer. I believe, the phenomenon of the destruction of the middle strata of this earlier period deserves to be revisited, as we are once again experiencing something of the same nature.¹⁰ In Egypt today one sees again a rise in suicidal behavior, and the Edward W. Lanes of today are attributing this once again—mistakenly—to the nature of Islam.

Another strand of late eighteenth-century studies, which *Islamic Roots* touches on, is regionalism in Egypt. By this I mean the influence of the Delta and the Ṣa'īd. Much more remains to be done. From the work of Laylā 'Abd al-Laṭīf on the tribal confederation of the Hawwāra and on its most famous eighteenth-century leader, Shaykh Hammām, it is obvious that a political culture existed in Upper Egypt, a political culture quite different from that of the Delta. From short references in al-Jabartī's account of the early nineteenth century, it appears that certain Mamluks had special relationships in Upper Egypt. What is known is that when the French came some of the Mamluks used the Ṣa'īd to hide in. Possibly, they hoped to lure the French to chase them there. Following the rise of Muḥammad 'Alī, the

chiefs and other powerful figures in Upper Egypt appear to have given their support to the state. This made Muḥammad 'Alī able to assert authority in Upper Egypt. Others in Upper Egypt opposed Muḥammad 'Alī and revolted. They were crushed in a series of campaigns in the nineteenth century. As for the Delta, it is apparent from trade history that this region was much more capitalist much earlier than was Upper Egypt. Land had a higher value there as well. If in the eighteenth century the Mamluks fought over the possession of the Delta, this would make sense, more sense, I claimed, than characterizing what was going on as hopeless and meaningless chaos and implying the need for foreign intervention.

Islamic Roots of Capitalism makes clear the importance of the late eighteenth-century period for the formation of modern culture. A precocious cultural clarification prefiguring modern times took place in the literary salons of Ṣūfīs in that period. It was an enlightenment, albeit one more of a Spanish or Mediterranean sort than of a French sort. It grew out of scholasticism. It achieved a new balance of reason and tradition. In theological terms, it was Maturidite, that is, it reflected a balance between Mu'tazilism (a free-will position) and Ash'arism (a predestination position). This period of enlightenment produced a major dictionary, a number of language books, and some history-writing. It showed as well an interest in science.¹¹ Like its counterparts elsewhere, this moment of enlightenment in the 1780's was pushed aside by a resurgent traditionalism in the early nineteenth century and finally absorbed in the modern culture of the late nineteenth century. In the case of Egypt this cultural production was preserved through these years by al-Azhar, the institution in which it was produced.

For those interested in demonstrating a link between the 1780's and the present, it is apparent that the struggle to maintain a theological middle ground for Egyptian civil society has been carried on from then to now by the leading figures. If one reads the Fatawī and the public statements of the Mufti of Egypt and of the Shaykh al-Azhar in recent times, one will find a continuing attempt to achieve this theological balance. Other evidence could be adduced making the continuing prestige of the old paradigm all the more paradoxical.

This brings me to another hypothesis about the dominant organization of culture. While in some instances it appears to be something approaching ruling-class ideology, at other times—and given certain power relationships—there is more to it than that. For many Egyptians, the attraction to 1798, to begin with, is a tangential part of their attraction to Muḥammad 'Alī, itself—in part—a revulsion from Isma'il. This attraction is also part of a kind of political "long Durée," a recognition of powerful rulers dating from at least the Arab Conquest. Muḥammad 'Alī, who ruled from 1805–1848, threw off the yoke of the "foreign" Ottomans and struggled for an independent existence for the country. Khedive Isma'il, who came to power in the 1860's, did nothing of the kind. Isma'il in fact appears weak; he capitulated increasingly to European colonial interests. As a result, it is difficult to credit him with the evolution of the modern structures of the state and

of the culture. He seems unworthy compared to Muḥammad 'Alī. There is some truth in all these propositions. What remains perplexing, however, given such assumptions, is why Egyptian writers do not then routinely adopt 1805 as the birth of modernity. Why is the concept of modernity so unresolved in Egypt?

To return to the "long *Durée*" idea, in relation to Egyptian history, the urban-based military man seems to modern Egyptians to be a liberator—the Muḥammad 'Alī, the 'Abd al-Nāṣir, while the weak ruler is something to be endured. The conquest of Egypt by 'Amr ibn al-'Aṣ in 661 brought Egypt the Arabic language and Islam, albeit it brought these to a country that was in no hurry to accept them. In fact, acceptance took centuries. Still from such experiences, or at least from the remembrance of them which long predates the present, comes some of the reinforcement for what today we call the dominant paradigm or "consensus."

When it comes to explaining the maintenance of consensus, one factor to consider is the options available to the oppressed. Indeed, only recently has it become clear to many people that elite history is not the only way of looking at the past and that social history has the potentiality of becoming a distinct alternative to elite history.¹² Fortunately, from my point of view, even in this short time during which social history has begun to become known, many have come to realize its significance. How far this awareness will develop remains to be seen. What is now generally clear is that if one writes history in terms of the "great man," one winds up marginalizing the rest of the society, and this is a high price to pay.

But, what happens if one does not want to marginalize the mass population, but one still has a certain reverence for the ruler? Anyone can collect facts about society, but how does one do class analysis without violating one's sensibilities about the powerful? This is a current area of "rethinking" both in academia and in society at large, and the outcome is not clear.¹³

Let us conclude this section on the influence of hegemony on paradigms by looking at history in the United States and the stake the United States has in the maintenance of the 1798 watershed paradigm. Perhaps the way to understand 1798 is one country at a time. On the positive side from my point of view, today, even in the United States, the heartland of the dominant paradigm, students doubt official interpretations of everything; more students raise questions about our nation and its history than did a decade ago. The answers students seem to want to hear about our national history range wildly as these are troubled times. Some students want a chauvinist answer; others want a more self-denigrating one. The latter want to hear that democracies began as settler states and were and are frankly racist and that today democracies still embody a system of rule by race. For me, the interesting point is that whatever sort of answer students are searching for, if they become inclined to look critically at U.S. history at all, they frequently are willing to employ social history and to take a critical look at their ideas about Egyptian history as well.

I think this is no accident; all democracies, the United States included,

draw on the Book of Exodus to justify their settler ancestors as Chosen People, as those who follow the Lord as Moses and his followers did. If Moses could kill thousands of Egyptians with the flood of the Red Sea so too the founding fathers of the modern democracies could kill indigenous peoples if need be. Criminal acts become righteous acts. And even if the violence and killing persist this does not make the country less of a land of the Chosen People. As one cannot make an omelette without breaking an egg, so with the Lord's work. In sum, as students rightly intuit, democracy could not exist without some rather specific ideas about Egypt.

It is this need for Egypt—like the need for Bible studies in general—that accounts, one could infer, for the immense investment in Egyptology and for the ongoing fascination in all these democracies with an obscure culture that witnessed Moses's rise and then his flight. Ancient Egypt is a necessary foil, to Westerners it is worth the investment for that reason. Obscure and religious, ancient Egypt makes no sense. This is its function. It is the function of Egyptology to make Egypt make no sense. If Egypt were made to make sense, or if Moses were generally seen as Egyptian (as Freud saw him), doubts about the wisdom of Moses's exodus would arise. If Moses were seen as Egyptian more interest would be focussed on the desire of the Jews to return to Egypt (Golden Calfism) and more interest would be concentrated on the Egyptian gypsies said to be Jews who did not leave. This would be dysfunctional.¹⁴

For the rather more narrow needs of this essay, suffice it to note that the culture of democracy is based on the fact that orientalism inherited from Biblical studies and Egyptology a certain view of Egypt. The Arabs are intruders; they are disruptive even if they cannot change what is eternal and essentially static for, here to repeat, this staticness of Egypt will remain until divinely blessed Westerners (or God himself) return to bring about change. For orientalism, and for what I term the dominant paradigm generally, this means that the parameters of study and the outcome of study are known in advance. The first biblical element is: Egypt is ruled by a pharaoh-like figure. This figure is by nature remote from his people and despotic.¹⁵ Thus we find the susceptibility among scholars and on the level of popular culture to a caliph-centered history, to an Ottoman-alooftness, to a Muḥammad 'Alī's iron-handedness, to Cromer's authoritarianism, and to Naṣīr's dictatorialism. Second, the mass population of Egyptians are still in effect "slaves" as in the Bible. This proposition is accepted by most contemporary scholars, although it might surprise some of them to see it phrased this way. Yet this explains, I believe, why Egyptian studies academically-speaking is an urban-centered field despite the fact that the country itself is so heavily rural. In fact, in so far as the countryside figures at all, it is mainly looked on as backward and in need of development. This proposition also explains why peasant uprisings have, until now, rarely been construed to have any bearing on the movement of history. Rather they are seen as meaningless.¹⁶ The third element handed down from biblical sociology is the idea of a mystery priest caste, the group with whom Moses quarreled.

The legacy of that part of Exodus today is revealed in the general scholarly assumption of the impenetrability of Egyptian cultural life by the Western mind. Scholars approach Egypt as a place where one or two shining lights, who turn to the West and become reformers, must be set against a background of hundreds of obscure and impenetrable thinkers. For this reason, Egyptian intellectual life is incomprehensible save for specialists.

In a recent work (and the most thorough one of its kind), the French historian Gilbert Delanoue produced a two volume collection of biographies of nineteenth-century Egyptian writers. The work has been well received. In pursuing the theme under discussion, what stands out is the mystery priest caste dimension. In presenting his material, Delanoue adheres quite literally to the Arabic *tarjama* (or formulaic biography style) as if this were Egyptology. One surmises that there was never an instance when the author felt some rapport with his subject or when he felt he could abandon the alien format he used to present these intellectuals except when he was dealing with the reformers. In another fairly recent work, Fred De Jong, the Dutch orientalist, made a similar catalogue, of nineteenth-century Egyptian *Ṣūfī's*. De Jong's work, like Delanoue's, is of considerable value at least for a specialized readership. Yet, as with Delanoue, one notes the mystery dimension. The net effect for the general reader is that these subjects truly are a mystery, that an ordinary Westerner cannot understand these clerics or *Ṣūfīs*. However, in numerous other works of modern scholarship on modern Middle Eastern culture going back to the field's classic point of departure, Albert Hourani's, *Arabic Thought in the Liberal Age, 1798-1939* (London: Oxford University Press, 1962) one finds quite the opposite impression is conveyed concerning the handful who are called reformers. Indeed, three or four such figures have been studied repeatedly, generally in terms of their similarity to the European middle class. Three of these are: Ṭaḥṭāwī, 'Alī Mubārak, and Muḥammad 'Abduh. Every year or so, new works about them appear. Naturally very little is added save changes of presentation. They are made to seem a bit more French-like, a bit more English-like.¹⁷ So like the *Ṣūfīs* we are made to believe we cannot understand, here then are the reformers we are made to believe we can understand. Such books in their totality are meant to assure us that the rays of Western civilization are slowly bringing even Egypt out of its hopeless condition.

To sum up these past few pages, failing to explain the persistence of the 1798 paradigm in terms of the findings of the scholarship which bore on the subject directly or even indirectly, I introduced the hypothesis of the influence of hegemony and of the organization of culture. This permitted me to postulate that given the way in which the system of cultural hegemony works in countries such as the United States, the categories of analysis for modern Egypt are actually drawn from an account of those of ancient Egypt and imposed on modern Egypt. The categories of analysis come specifically from the Exodus story, and these categories, being very central ones, override the categories of scientific analysis, which might otherwise apply to the study of any other modern country.

What then holds this organization of culture in place for my colleague who decides to write a book and finds material which does not fit it? Is it a conspiracy or simply a tolerance for cognitive dissonance among specialists? How long will this organization of culture survive? How long can categories like the 1798 watershed, which do so badly as science and do so well as politics, survive without beginning to erode the prestige of science itself? Let us conclude the essay with a few reflections on these wider subjects.

To begin such a discussion, a little more precision about what is a hegemony—and if we focus the discussion on the United States, more specifically a democratic hegemony—appears to be in order. From there, it will be possible to turn to questions of change on the level of what I have been calling the organization of culture. I use the term hegemony here as I do in *Beyond Eurocentrism* to characterize the type of systems of control employed by the rulers of our modern nation-states. Such a definition implies some familiarity with nineteenth-century social history. The rise of a fairly unmanageable level of class conflict in the last third of the nineteenth century induced rulers nearly everywhere to seek a new viable form of hegemony. In order to continue to rule, rulers had to find a way to deflect this class conflict, to divide the mass population, and to play it off against itself. In the countries we term democracies, the rulers opted for playing race against class. In time this led to the creation of the familiar modern tableau of ghettos and of a permanent racial undercaste. Rulers in other forms of hegemony facing similar problems made different choices and organized their cultures and their means of coercion accordingly. In Egypt, as I noted, the ruling class adopted the class against region approach, in the process suppressing the aspirations of the Şa'īd or the South.

The next point in the discussion about democracy is that there are two commonly-existing forms of democracy. The first form consists of those democracies that are somewhat introspective. These democracies manifest, despite their history of settler conquest, an awareness in their organization of culture of the need for political rights of their indigenous peoples. The second form encompasses those democracies that are not in the least introspective. These democracies manifest themselves in a more crusaderist light—the “no good Indian but a dead Indian” school of thought. The former type appear more grounded in themselves, territorially and spiritually, the latter seem more dependent on their Westernness and hence on the Middle East as an active essential part of their identity. Canada, the Scandinavian countries, and the Low Countries are representatives of the first form of democracy; the United States and pre-Intifadah Israel are examples of the second. South Africa, until recent years, wavered between the two, as Britain does today.

When one looks at the more introspective democracies, one finds a pronounced level of interest in peace, often reflected in NGO activity. In addition, one finds among them an unusually high awareness of the Palestine Question and of other largely contemporary social problems. In such countries, one also finds a muted orientalism—the Hilma Granqvists, the Ed-

vard Westernmarks. When one looks at the crusaderist democracies and how they view the Middle East, one finds that for them—ruling class interest in oil apart—the contemporary Middle East is an extension of the biblical one. In the absence of God, the Middle East needs the United States as a savior, be it from its Nebuchadnezzars, such as Saddam Husayn, or just in general to offer guidance and promote change. It goes without saying that the Middle East cannot change by itself or resolve its problems on its own.

The old Israel functioned in this crusaderist mold and embodied similar assumptions. It is useful to consider Israel as it is closer to the United States than is Canada or Scandinavia. Before the Palestinian Intifadah, most Israelis believed their country was the logical bridge between the West and the non-Western Middle East, in essence a blameless utopia threatened by irrational Arab countries. After Camp David, and more especially after the Intifadah, one finds a new post-crusaderist historiography emerging. Contrasts are becoming clear.

The old scholarship, as represented in the historical research of the late much respected scholar, Gabriel Baer, presented the Arabs as fairly static. Egyptian history in his books was particularly unchanging, give or take whatever change the coming of the West imposed. The more recent scholarship in contrast opens the door to the idea of a new Middle East being born in the First World War. The historian Ehud Toledano (*State and Society in mid-nineteenth Century Egypt*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), a representative of the new school, finds nineteenth-century Egypt even through the Age of Isma'il to still be "Ottoman" but change is in the offing. Whatever one may think of his assumptions, his work constitutes a considerable shift for a mainstream writer in a democracy of this sort.¹⁸

To certain elements of what I am terming the Israeli new school, it has become apparent that Israel faces problems retaining its Mosaic base while trying to make peace with Egypt unless it can reconstruct its image of Egypt quite significantly. Otherwise, peace with Egypt would imply that the sons of the Pharaoh had formed a country like any other. That in turn would open the door to the question of why Moses left. It is not an accident that today Israelis debate about what it means to be a Jew, about whether Israel is a Jewish state or a state for those who live there, and about many other issues as well that the United States and other crusaderist democracies have really yet to face.

The larger point here to repeat is that paradigm change is bound up with hegemony change: Rethinking Israel and rethinking Egypt seems to be bound up together for Israelis with coming to grips with an independent Palestine. Whether this will actually come to pass is hard to know. Some Israelis welcome the possibility that their country would abandon crusaderism and grant the Palestinians a state; others abhor the idea. The latter take the view that as they have the upperhand now, they should get the maximum they can get. Why not drive the Palestinians out of Jerusalem, etc.? This is the crusaderist side. Israelis call it the "Iron Triangle" philosophy from the writings of Jabotinsky. Its bedrock calculation is that one can

take a communalist position against the Palestinians. If one can do it fast enough, one can create facts, as Moshe Dayan once said. Of course, Zionists of all stripes know that there are risks in trying to create facts. If one legitimates such acts by word or deed, one opens the door to Christian fundamentalists (if not Nazis) who are waiting in the wings for this type of policy to be legitimated.

In sum, in reflecting on the gradual growth of awareness of Palestinian rights in Israel, of American Indian rights in the United States, and of Irish and Commonwealth peoples' rights in Britain, one might anticipate the day when these countries would all become more introspective (as Canada is today). When this introspection comes, more holocaust museums will be opened, more compensation money will be paid for wrongs done in the past, and a new image of Egypt will gradually appear in the national scholarship. The more a democracy can acknowledge what it has done to its indigenous people, the more it can form its identity in terms of where it is in the world; it can finally feel it has its own place and it belongs there. As this happens, the people living in a democracy no longer have to lean so heavily on their Westernness. The reverse seems also to be true. The more a democracy denies its indigenous people their just political rights, the more it remains Western and crusaderist, the more it freezes its picture of Egypt, and in turn, the more dependent it is on the 1798 watershed idea.

In this essay reintroducing the *Islamic Roots of Capitalism*, I have struck a fairly optimistic note about the technical progress of scholarship by specialists over the past generation and about the way this appears to be contributing dialectically to the gradual progressive change in American democracy. What is implied, of course, is a hope that if this change continues more knowledge of Egyptian history will in the future be integrated into different national cultures and that gradually 1798 will be dropped.

As I expressed the hope that the American movement for Indian rights and for Afro-American rights would grow, so I also hope that the Egyptian awareness of the oppression of Upper Egypt will grow. I hope that more and more Egyptians will come to realize that they are not living in some ancient hydraulic society but rather that they are living in a modern nation state, one which, in fact, is similar to others nearby, such as Italy. I hope more Egyptians will become aware that the hydraulic society idea has been in reality a way of covering over what the modern rulers of Egypt have been doing, which is exploiting Upper Egyptians. A recognition that there are politics in archaicizing one's country's identity would certainly encourage the new generation of intellectuals to rethink the question of what is modern Egypt and what existed before it. Such thoughts would no doubt lead to an interest in early modern Egyptian history.

A final cautionary note is in order. In what I have written, I have been assuming that the vehicle through which new ideas would be expressed would be history. And, while this is a conventional enough position for a historian to have, one might do well to note that the progress of the study of history, although likely, is not totally assured. Such progress depends not

just on political but also on economic conditions over which the historian has no control.

History, at least our modern form of social history, depends more than the older forms of history specifically on the power of the middle strata. If we look back in modern history to see when social history arose we find that there was very little of it during the first age of finance capitalism when the middle strata was weak. During that period—roughly from the 1860's to the Russian Revolution of 1917, the New Deal of 1932, or the 1952 Revolution, depending on the country—the middle strata worked directly for the ruling class and wrote elite history. It simply did not have the autonomy to write the modern-type social history. Karl Marx was a very considerable exception during that period. He was a person from the lower middle class, free to produce social analysis by virtue of having a patron in Engels. Even then, his family paid a high price.

Social history as a genre emerged after the turn to corporatism (cross-class rule) and to developmentalism on the part of ruling classes in this century. During this phase, one extending—depending on the country—from the 1920's to 1970, the ruling classes turned from the classical liberalism and globalism typical of nineteenth-century finance capitalism to the idea of a partnership with the petty bourgeoisie, accepting as well—depending on the hegemony—such ideas as development, planning, and welfare as the price they would have to pay to retain the cooperation of their partner. Thus the welfare state was born in many countries, or, if not a full welfare state, at least the social contract and a new social order lasting, as I just noted, until around 1970. In this period in the writings of E. P. Thompson, Christopher Hill, and Eric Hobsbawm, social history was born in the United Kingdom. In France, the *Annales* School developed. In the United States social history also flourished.

As the student of political economy well knows, important changes, however, were in the offing. Capitalists were dissatisfied with the partnership they had made; their manufacturing businesses were stagnant, and as this stagnation continued year after year, they grew increasingly restless. By 1970, a unilateral swing back to finance capitalism and to classical liberalism was well under way. In Egypt, this has been called the "Open Door" and in the United States this is sometimes called Reaganism or neoliberalism. Its hallmark, then as now, is a savage attack on the middle strata of society, an acceptance of a high level of societal chaos, and environmental degradation in return for high short-term profit.

The flourishing of social history, a trend that emerged at the end of the corporatist age and that has continued into the era of neoliberalism, is thus not a sure thing. The class producing it is threatened. The middle strata could wither away to the level of its nineteenth-century antecedent. Its intelligentsia could be forced to produce elite history and to abandon social history in order to survive. This has happened before, it could happen again. Indeed, signs of such a transition certainly exist. The *Annales* School no longer follows Braudel and his humanism but simply collects and publishes

data. In the United Kingdom and the United States, the new social history is decidedly apolitical and data-centered as well. The Subaltern Studies in India, to name a third main center of social history production, after a very progressive phase, is currently emphasizing the subjectivity of poor Indians as a way of promoting their otherness, if not their outright oppression. Subalternists today oppose political economy, which in any case these days is in retreat as it is now much more concerned with trade than with class struggle.¹⁹

In the study of Egypt, one is struck by the threat to social history and to social analysis as well. Training is deteriorating; funding is down. In both Egypt and the Western countries the new generation of scholars in formation is floundering as a result. The important rising trend is one fetishizing European travellers and foreign travel books, a trend reminiscent of that current in Middle East studies in the late nineteenth century. Today Europe (or deconstruction) becomes a way of explaining Egyptian history again as in the nineteenth century.²⁰

To conclude on a more optimistic note, like a good many other writers in the political economy tradition, I also believe that this current cycle of finance capitalism with its accompanying attack on the middle strata is destined to be a good deal shorter than the previous one. I believe this to be the case for several reasons. First, capitalism as a system depends on a degree of stability. To achieve this stability it made many compromises against its interests with the middle strata before. It will do so again. Today, the potentiality for instability, if not chaos, is far greater than it ever was in the nineteenth century. The world's population is far larger today than it was then; the strain on the food supply and on the ecology is far greater as well. Fewer people are on the land feeding themselves today than at that time; the industrial economy does not serve to employ as many people world-wide as it once did because of its heavy concentration in East Asia. In short, the possibilities of chaos are everywhere. Bosnia and Rwanda are the tip of the iceberg. Class struggle is everywhere as well; it is creating what pundits refer to as political instability. Many countries have become unsafe for the bourgeoisie to travel in without taking precautions. I would give the cycle another decade.

Given the above, social history appears likely to survive; people's struggle will allow it to survive. Struggle will produce change, and social historians will have a role to play explaining and legitimating that change. Gradually, as change occurs inside countries, such as the United States or Egypt, the field of late eighteenth-century Egyptian history, for so long in the background, will gradually take off, putting 1798 in its proper perspective in the process.

Notes

1. I would like to take the opportunity to thank here the colleagues who read this draft—Rifa'at 'Ali Abou-El-Haj, Talal Asad, Nelly Hanna, Amira Sonbol, and Thomas C. Patterson. I mainly use 1798, the date of the French invasion with the supposed introduction of the printing press and of private property, and 1805, the rise of Muḥammad 'Alī, who reformed the army, the bureaucracy, and the education system under the aegis of the French, interchangeably. This is common practice. While, as the book makes clear, there is plenty of room for discomfort with all these claimed reforms, what is discussed in this chapter is strictly the broader question of paradigm. Does one describe these events—and those before and those after—better in terms of the idea of a Europe waking up a sleeping Orient? Or are they better described in terms of an ongoing Egyptian historical dynamic, one in which a fairly sophisticated Egyptian ruling class was imposing technical changes (e.g., by hiring foreign technicians) and in which other changes were taking place as well, e.g., in culture and politics from 1760–1861?

It might not be amiss to draw the reader's attention to a curious side issue not entered into in the text. If *Islamic Roots's* two most controversial claims were: (1) the idea that the eighteenth century saw the beginning of the movement toward modern Egypt and (2) the idea that modern Egypt emerged out its own internal struggles more than out of the activities of foreigners, then it seems a bit odd that the first of these rather controversial claims would not have been considered as controversial a generation ago as it is today. Why? I am not sure. See Gabriel Guémard, *Une oeuvre française: Les Réformes en l'Égypte d'Ali Bey el-Kebir à Mehemet Ali, 1760–1848* (Cairo: Paul Barbey, 1936); Antonio Virzi, *La formazione dell'Egitto Moderno ed il contributo italiano al suo risorgimento politico e civile-gli albori della rinascita egiziana (1760–1840)* (Messina: Marlo Pappalardo, 1938). The hypothesis most congruent with the material presented in this article is that the combination of the Cold War and the 1952 Revolution leading to the deepening of a nationalist historiography in Egypt forced a new—and arguably more reactionary—consensus on the origins of Egyptian modernity, moving the critical date from 1760 to 1798. If one looks at this as the fine tuning of the existing paradigm in a more reactionary direction, then the use of Napoleón as an exemplar of the Chosen People returning to bring progress to Egypt may represent a working out of the logic better than the option of relying on lesser-known French or Italian figures who played a role in eighteenth-century Egypt à la Guémard or Virzi. An article suggesting a strong focus on the rise of a Napoleonic watershed among Egyptian historians is M. M. El-Souroughy, "Egyptian Historiography of Napoleon Bonaparte in the Twentieth Century," *Egyptian Historical Review* 20 (1973): 1–27. Two final points—first, if 1798 fits the universal paradigm of the "Rise of the West," which it does, it does so at the expense of Egyptian history more or less the way Renaissance fits the universal paradigm at the expense of Italian history—see William J. Bouwsma, "The Renaissance and the Drama of Western History," *American Historical Review* 84/1 (1979): 1–15. In both cases, the universal paradigm seems to ride roughshod over the local reality. Second, and in light of the above, comes the decision to call this book the

Islamic Roots of Capitalism. As the review by Professor Leonard Binder (discussed below) makes clear, this book is intended as a challenge (corrective?) to the tradition of historiography just mentioned, a tradition which in effect subsumes Egyptian history under Islamic history and denies that the one or the other has any relevance to the modern world. To redress this error, the book takes the form of an Islamic-centered study of Egyptian culture and political economy imposed on top of which is a biography of Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār, a figure important in both eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Egyptian culture and active in Ottoman Turkey and Syria as well. Al-ʿAṭṭār was a Muslim cleric and a modernizing figure; his career highlights a number of features of Egyptian culture in a transitional century, one leading to the capitalist nation-state phase beginning in the 1860's with Khedive Ismaʿīl. There is a tension between the history and the biography, as several reviewers have noticed, and this was, as I hope the reader will understand, deliberate.

This said, however, had the paradigm situation not discouraged it, as I felt it did, I probably would have called this book the "Cultural Roots of the Italian Road: Egypt, 1760–1840" and gone into more types of Egyptian modern material than I did. Not only did the Muslims in the late eighteenth century resurrect inspirational figures from the past in their writings but so too did the Coptic Christians in their art, as I discovered recently from Cawthra Mulock and Martin Telles Langdon, *The Icons of Yuhanna and Ibrahim the Scribe* (London: Nicholson and Watson, 1946). If scholastic writing led to modern writing, why should not icon painting have led to modern portraits and landscape painting in Egypt? Such themes need to be researched.

2. Afaf Marsot, "The Political and Economic Function of the 'Ulama' in the Eighteenth Century," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 16 (1973): 130–154; "The Role of the 'Ulama' in Egypt during the Early Nineteenth Century," *Social Change in Modern Egypt* edited by P. M. Holt (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968): 264–280; Sabri Hafez, *The Genesis of Arabic Narrative Discourse* (London: Saqi Books, 1993); P. Gran, *Beyond Eurocentrism: A New View of Modern World History* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1996); P. Gran, "Egypt 1760–1815, A Period of Enlightenment?" in H. Sakkut, B. O'Kane, T. Abdullah, and M. Serag (eds.) *Studies in Honor of Marsden Jones* (Cairo: American University in Cairo, 1998) forthcoming. Jamāl al-Dīn al-Shayyāl, *Muhadarāt 'an al-ḥarakah al-iṣlāḥīyah wa marākiz al-thaqāfah* . . . (Cairo, 1957–8).
3. Kenneth Cuno, *The Pasha's Peasants* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); Layla ʿInān, *Al-Ḥamlah al-Firansīyah bayna al-uṣṭūrāh wa al-ḥaqīqah* (Cairo, 1992); Jane Hathaway, *The Politics of Households in Ottoman Egypt* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); André Raymond, *Le Caire des Janissaires* (Paris: CNRS, 1995); Afaf Marsot, *Women and Men in Late Eighteenth Century Egypt* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1995).
4. Rifaʿat ʿAlī Abou-El-Haj, *Formation of the Modern State* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991); Nelly Hanna, *Making Big Money in 1600* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1997) forthcoming.
5. Amira Sonbol, *The Creation of a Medical Profession in Egypt* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1991).

xl Introduction

6. Khaled Fahmy, *All the Pasha's Men* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Timothy Mitchell, *Colonising Egypt* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991). An Islamic trend history that emphasizes the Ottoman basis of modern Egypt is represented by Ahmad 'Alī Maḥjūb, *Al-Waḥm wa al-ḥaqīqah fī al-fīkr al-Miṣrī al-ḥadīth* (Cairo, 1993).
7. Historical linguistics as a field is very undeveloped.
8. Given the subject matter of the book, most of the reviewers were American or Western Europeans, so I hypothesize they reflected the cultural structure of democracy. Where they were Egyptian, I hypothesized that they reflected an "Italian Road"-type hegemony, see A Note on Critical Reception.
9. 'Abd al-Raḥīm 'Abd al-Raḥmān 'Abd al-Raḥīm, "Dirāsāt fī maṣādir ta' rīkh Miṣr fī al-'aṣr l-'uthmānī "Dirāsa nuṣṣiya li'l kitāb hazz al-quḥūf fī sharḥ qaṣīdat Abī Shaduf," *Egyptian Historical Review* 20 (1973): 217–295. One of the few Western scholars finding value in the supposedly sterile literary and scholastic forms is Baber Johansen, "Legal Literature and the Problem of Change: The Case of the Land Rent," in *Islam and Public Law* edited by Chibli Mallat (London: Graham and Chapman, 1993): 29–47.
10. Here I want to commend the attempt of Fred Lawson, *The Social Origins of Egyptian Expansionism During the Muhammad Alī Period* (Columbia: Columbia University Press, 1992) at connecting peasant revolts with Muḥammad 'Alī's decision to invade other countries. It seems like a hypothesis which could be pursued in a variety of ways.
11. See Clorinda Donato, "Eighteenth Century Encyclopedias and National Identity," *History of European Ideas* 16 (1993): 4–6, 959–965 for the suggestion of emphasizing al-Zabīdī and Aḥmad Damanḥūrī over al-'Aṭṭār for the takeoff of modern Egyptian culture. See Yusuf Zaydan, *Al-Turāth al-majhūl* (Cairo, 1994): 213–227 for the view that the eighteenth-century renaissance had nothing to do with modern times. For Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār's simply being a witness to the transition and not really a part of it, see Nicole Khouri, "Hassan al-'Aṭṭār ou la figure d'un Rhéteur à l'aube de la Modernité" (Entre le Caire et Istanbul: 1770–1830). *Modernisation et Nouvelles Formes de Mobilisation Sociale* (Cairo: CEDEJ, 1992): 67–77 employs a Parisian-centered conception of what is modern by which to judge al-'Aṭṭār in order to remove him and make way for the presumed role of France in modernizing Egypt. Apparently there is still to be no space for an Egyptian premodernity. Elsewhere, I have presented my own idea of how Egypt evolved, suggesting that Egypt—seen as social history—developed on its own and is actually more like Italy than France, despite the efforts at different times of the French, the English, and the Americans to mold the country in their own image, cf. "The Writing of Egyptian History," *Newsletter of the American Research Center in Egypt* #160 (Winter 1993): 1–6. For the Egyptian reception of this book and additional evidence for the view that Egypt is best understood as "Italian Road," see A Note on Critical Reception.
12. Rifa'at 'Alī Abou-El-Haj, "The Social Uses for the Past: Recent Arab Historiography of Ottoman Rule," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 14/2 (1982): 185–201. This article points out that nationalist historiography in the Arab world is forced to pay a price in order to glorify modern leaders. This price includes a falsification of the Ottoman past, which is made to serve as a scapegoat for the problems of the present. As the text makes clear as well, if one writes nationalist history, the activities of

foreigners loom large, there being a rather considerable reliance on the role of colonialism or of imperialism. In practice, the reader finds the result to be a convergence of European colonial and third world elite historiography.

13. This I take to be a priority for the field.
14. Michael Walzer, *Exodus and Revolution* (New York: Basic Books, 1984).
15. Most Westerners accept this implication quite readily. Egyptians who want to retain the dominant paradigm emphasize that for most of Egyptian history, non-Egyptians have ruled the country. As social history grows, one can expect the view of this to change to one of ruling classes and their use of foreign figureheads.
16. Nathan Brown, *Peasant Politics in Modern Egypt* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990) argues that despite numerous uprisings, the Egyptian peasantry have not had a significant impact on modern history.
17. Gilbert Delanoue, *Moralistes et Politiques Musulmans dans l'Égypte du XIX^e Siècle* (Cairo: IFAO, 1992); Fred De Jong, *Turuq and Turuq-linked Institutions in Nineteenth-Century Egypt* (Leiden: Brill, 1978).
18. Gabriel Baer, "Review . . ." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 25/2 (1982): 217–222, see A Note on Critical Reception.
19. Gran, "Subaltern Studies as Praxis in India and in the United States," in *History After the Three Worlds Issues in Recent Historiography* edited by V. Bahl, A. Dirlik and P. Gran, forthcoming. The reader interested in the theme of neoorientalism will find interesting the contribution of Rifa'at 'Ali Abou-El-Haj, "Historiography in West-Asian and North African Studies Since Said's *Orientalism* 1978:.
20. As in the nineteenth century, travellers and travel books are today zooming in popularity.

A Note on Critical Reception

Reception in the Democracies (De Jong and Binder)

What stands out in the reviews from the democracies are two main points that illustrate my notion of a "necessary" gap between facts and paradigms: positivism is a dominant epistemology and relative cultural openness on the level of facts or concepts exists, yet so does a considerable measure of rigidity when a theoretical challenge to the premises of positivist history is presented.

For an example of the openness of the "reviewer" to the new and to the unexpected on the level of detail, see Nikki R. Keddie, "The History of the Muslim Middle East," in *The Past Before Us* edited by Michael Kammen (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980) chapter 5, especially on page 141 where this book, was commended for breaking with the tendency to center on the West and to emphasize the great man. For an example of the other extreme, that of theoretical rigidity, see Fred De Jong, "On Peter Gran, *Islamic Roots of Capitalism: Egypt 1760-1840*, A Review Article with Author's Reply," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 14 (1982): 381-399; "The Itinerary of Ḥasan Al-ʿAṭṭār (1766-1835): A Reconsideration and Its Implication," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 28/1 (1993): 99-128. On the surface, what appears here are articles arguing against the idea of a salon in eighteenth-century Egypt and, by extension, arguing against the importance of the culture of the eighteenth century and, presumably, arguing for the culture of modern times. These articles also argue for a visit by al-ʿAṭṭār to Albania, a visit which would add, as De Jong put it, a bit of the unplanned in a life which progressed more from al-ʿAṭṭār's reading and reflection than from the influence of the people and environment around him. When one gets below the surface of these two arguments, the choice of points bespeaks a very strong urge to defend the "Rise of the West" and to emphasize the distinction between the religious and the secular and other quasi-theoretical positions associated with positivism. In contrast to the reviewers of *Islamic Roots* who picked up pieces which attracted or offended them, De Jong's approach was to judge the book as a whole as right or wrong.

This said, the integrity of De Jong's argument lies in the specific points he makes and in his understanding of particular matters. I certainly consider these worthy of discussion.

I will begin with the issue of a possible sojourn by Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār in Albania. The technical problem here is fragmentary, external, and retrospective sources. De Jong does not show signs of being troubled by this fact. Rather he accepts the existing sources as accurate if not canonical, i.e., 'Alī

Mubārak's *Khiṭaṭ Tawfiqīya* and al-Ḥusaynī's manuscript (see full citations in the bibliography of the book) and then proceeds to lean on the odd phrase in the colophons of al-'Aṭṭār's books and manuscripts to assist him in reaching his conclusion. By contrast, I am more reticent, having no idea about the relationship of al-Ḥusaynī to al-'Aṭṭār, much less that of Mubārak to al-'Aṭṭār. I suppose they relied on al-'Aṭṭār for their information, but even about al-'Aṭṭār we know very little, if he is to serve as our primary source. We suspect the years in question were stressful for him. He was always seeking a patron; we are told he was married and had a child, but that both his wife and child died. For some reason, his former wife's kinsmen came to Cairo some years later and fought with him. Should one take al-'Aṭṭār's word? Should one accept instead the word of these later sources about where he was and what he was doing? Or is it safer to stick with a simpler account—the approach I lean toward—placing his travel as taking him to the main centers of learning (Istanbul area, Damascus) and not Scutari in Albania? While both of us are in a weak position for the moment, De Jong prefers to make an argument from the authority of the source; I argue one from the context. The differences seem clear enough. In all probability Albanian and Turkish research will eventually settle this matter. My guess is that when it is settled we will know a few more details about the life of this interesting figure.

To make my position clear, I, too, rely on Mubārak and Ḥusaynī, as De Jong does, but I credit these sources with more certain knowledge about events occurring in Egypt when these authors lived, events occurring in roughly—or not too much before—the authors' own lifetimes. Thus I am more open to accepting their claim that al-'Aṭṭār returned from his overseas travel to Cairo in 1815, a claim which troubles De Jong, who would have al-'Aṭṭār return in 1813. Here two other issues of worldview conflict appear to underlie the surface discussion of technicalities. First, I am skeptical—to repeat myself—about all the source materials, and I am certainly not disposed to canonize them. Second, I am not surprised that a *shaykh* would travel in search of knowledge in a coherent fashion. These are two points De Jong appears to strongly dispute, strongly enough to write an entire article about them. Perhaps De Jong's position can be explained by his views on the Middle East during this period, perhaps by his views about religious personalities versus secular ones, or perhaps by his general view of the minimal role played by environment on the way writers form their ideas.

Another terrain in which De Jong and I disagree with each other has to do with the meaning of the word *majlis* in the eighteenth century. *Majlis* implies meeting or sitting together. I claim it to be broadly cultural in implication; he understands it to be narrowly religious. Whether De Jong restricts his disagreement simply to the meetings of the Wafā'iyya Ṣūfī order, emphasized in this book, to those of all Ṣūfī orders, or whether he believes there were no literary clubs of any importance, I cannot tell. The point I want to underscore is how divergent are the approaches typical of

orientalism from those of modern history, how orientalism appears to rise to the defense of consensus ideology against a perceived challenge often through a narrow philological approach.

As a historian reading cultural materials, it seems inescapable to me, that one must conclude, as Samir Amin does in *Arab Nation*, that the general trend in Arab history was a modern cultural formation in earlier times, partially eclipsed by a more precapitalist one coming later—the reverse of that of Western Europe. Cultural salons (*majālis*) attracting Ṣūfis and the middle strata have been an important institution for easily the last thousand years, serving to keep this culture alive. De Jong argues otherwise. If the text as he reads it does not spell all this out, there is no recourse to the wider logic of context, such as I would rely on. In addition, there is no recourse to reflexivity. The issue of who one is and why one reads in a certain way is not part of the discussion.

Even in De Jong's own terms, his rejection of the idea of the *majlis* as a cultural salon seems a little extreme in the face of such a rich body of references. My quote from Muḥammad Kilānī's *Al-Adab al-Miṣrī fī zill al-ḥukm al-'Uthmānī*, the most famous cultural study of the period, where the author (on pages 145ff, as I noted, quoting and paraphrasing al-Jabartī or to be precise al-Jabartī, 'Ajā'ib al-āthār fī l-tarājim wa' l-akhbār [Cairo: Būlāq Press, 1879] 4, 187) shows from al-Jabartī that the Ṣūfī Khalīfa Muḥammad Abī Anwār himself was a student of literature, an appreciator of this-worldly fields, and a participant in *majālis* in which every field was discussed. This by itself ought to deter blanket statements about what was or what was not going on in Ṣūfī circles and *majālis*. (Kilānī goes on to note that al-Zabīdī, a major religious scholar as well as a litterateur, joined the Ṣūfis and became the star of the order.) De Jong rejects this idea of *majlis* as a cultural salon stating that *majlis* simply means a sitting room for religious functions. In reading his work, my guess is that he confuses *majlis* with *ḥalqah*, a more specifically religious meeting.

Heyworth-Dunne, who is certainly still regarded as an expert on eighteenth-century Egyptian culture, wrote an article cited in my bibliography on a poetic circle in mid-eighteenth century Egypt. He noted that a poet, Shaykh Qāsim al-Miṣrī, attached himself to the Wafā'ī family writing many poems in their honor while participating in a "clique" of other poets (685). The same source indicates that most of the poets of the eighteenth century were *shaykhs*, giving as one example among many others, a close friend of al-Zabīdī's, Shaykh 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ajūrī.

De Jong's response to this type of information was to insist that these poets were not real members of the Ṣūfī orders. He maintained that even if they were inducted and given honorific names (the *taknīya* ceremony), they were not important. Why, one wonders? From De Jong's own book on Ṣūfī orders in nineteenth-century Egypt, material to form a hypothesis emerges. In this book published in 1978, one finds a detailed account of the existing Ṣūfī organizations taken from a bureaucratic perspective and presented with great philological depth. Philology is the field in which De Jong is strongest.

Reading his work, one can intuit his worldview and perhaps thus explain the views put forward in his review of my book. Four points struck me reading his book: (1) the incredible emphasis on the collecting of material, (2) the complete lack of any dynamic or notion of change in his portrayal of Egyptian Sūfism, (3) the perception of an enormous distance separating the Sūfis from the society in which they lived, and (4) canonical sources; this was the most important.

Among De Jong's canonical sources were the writings of Tawfiq al-Bakrī (see my bibliography for citations) and those of Aḥmad Shaffq, two well-known writers at the turn of this century. This is an important point because by the time these writers were on the scene, the modern state of Egypt had arisen with all that implies about the theoretical separation of the religious sphere from the secular sphere. By this time, the traditional cultural function of the *majlis* was taken over by the coffee house and the university. The few *majālis*, clubs, and salons remaining concerned themselves primarily with literary and political issues—not religious ones. In order to evaluate Shaffq's and al-Bakrī's value as sources, given the changing times, one needs to ask who were these writers and what was their slant. Suffice it to note that these writers were important people enmeshed in the prevailing conditions of their times. Al-Bakrī was a leading Sūfi official of the new age.

From all this I conclude that those who enter Sūfi studies through religion and culture are less likely to oppose the idea of the *majlis* as a cultural institution, the idea of Sūfis as culture-bearers, or the idea of Sūfis as wine drinkers in this period—cf. Kılantı, *Fī rubū' al-Azbakiya*. The same applies to those who enter Sūfi studies from historical sociology. Had De Jong come this way, he would have moved on from his first books, seized on the available model for twentieth-century Egypt of Sūfis as a "hidden government," and emerged with a second book. By coming in through philology, he entered the hard way—politics aside—and this may account for the rigidity of his views about my book. It may also account for the problems he had in his book in dealing with the change in the Ṭuruq. Possibly it may also explain the non-appearance after nearly fifteen years of the book he promised in 1983 on Sūfism in post-Ottoman Egypt which was then forthcoming from Brill. Perhaps De Jong does not want to see the Ṭuruq as a part of government or of civil society. In any case, I hope he still will publish his book.

A second figure, one whose views were even more explicitly theoretical than De Jong's was Leonard Binder, author of *Islamic Liberalism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988): (209–239 *im passim*) His book assessed Middle East studies in the United States. To my knowledge, this was a well-received book, and, I believe, also the last such large-scale attempt. In this work Binder saw the field as composed of trends: a dominant liberal trend in both the United States and the Middle East and then fringe trends. He took my book to be part of a fringe trend created by Maxime Rodinson (*Islam and Capitalism*), which he termed the "Islam and Capitalism"

trend, a trend he seemed to find characterized by extreme reductionism. Looked at in general terms, I take Binder's way of posing the traditional conflict of liberalism and marxism as a defense of consensus ideology á la De Jong. Looked at more specifically, Binder reflects a line of thought in social science that might be summarized in the following way. While enlightened Islamic reformers appreciate the West and for that matter capitalism, Islamic thinkers in general do not. If Islam is made equal to capitalism that is not so much a question of right or wrong as it is one of reductionism. Binder is similar to De Jong in that both men want to frame their commentary in such a way that only one view of the world, positivism, has scientific merit. For De Jong, it is a simple matter of philology; for Binder, there is the Weberian mainstream and then the fringe. I cannot speak for Rodinson, but for my own work two points seem germane. First, the idea of "Islam and Capitalism" comes out of Middle Eastern writing where it is a major trend and by no means a fringe one. Second, it is apparent that the argument of my book—and I believe of Rodinson's as well—is not against the contribution of Islam to feudal, to communal, or to other noncapitalist forms of economy. What is intended is middle-level historical sociology. Binder takes my findings and insists that the parts he likes are really Weberian, not Marxist, and hence acceptable because I use the word culture. When he dismisses the parts he does not care for because my findings about Egypt do not fit Morocco, or when he writes that my comments about Egyptian modernity reflect my feelings, one can easily enough detect the motivational theme I have been discussing—positivism and consensus ideology—themes driving him to evaluate the book the way he did, to find it reductionist. What for De Jong was philology, for Binder was Weberianism.

Egyptian Reception of the Book

In 1992 the Arabic edition came out under the auspices of a historian, the late Dr. Ṭāhir 'Abd al-Ḥakīm and of his publishing house Dār al-Fikr. What emerged following the publication of the book was for me evidence of the degree to which the romantic world view, á la heritage (*turāth*), was important to Egyptian culture. If the positivist worldview is dominant in democracies such as the United States, so romanticism is the dominant worldview in Egypt and in other countries that I believe to be "Italian Road." having said this, there is in Egypt, as in the United States, a considerable amount of diversity to account for. For example, in the case of Egypt one can identify a subgroup for whom heritage is particularly central. Among such people in Egypt today, one might include the translator Maḥ-rūs Sulaymān as well as the publisher noted above. One would also include the journalist Sāmī Khashaba, who introduced my book to the Egyptian public in a series of articles in the *Ahrām* in October 1983. One would include as well the manuscript specialist Yūsuf Zaydan who commented on it more recently in *Al-Turāth al-majhūl*. From the perspective of de-

fending the idea of the 1798 paradigm, the main supporters came from a subordinate section of the Egyptian left—see the review of Suzanne Maḥmūd in *Qaday' a fikriya* (Aug. 1986): 421–425. Other reviewers from the left, including 'Āṭif Aḥmad in *Al-Qāhira* (April 1993) and Muḥammad Yūnis in *Adab wa Naqd* (1993), accepted most of the premises of the book and discussed weaknesses in the translation and problems of method, rather than the issue of 1798. The book was assured a hearing as a result of Samir Amin's essay in *Al-Mustaqbal al-'Arabi* (Mar. 1985): 73–84, an article which had appeared earlier in *Monthly Review* (Sept. 1984): 13–21. Amin is well known for his efforts to rewrite the history of capitalism and of modernity; he commented on the time I spent on Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār. Two other writers from the Egyptian left who reviewed the book were Mahmud Amin al-'Alim in *Al-Yasār al-'Arabi* (Nov. 1980) and Farida al-Naqqāsh in *Adab wa Naqd* (1993); both accepted the role of older heritage. The late Aḥmad Ṣādiq Sa'd spoke to me at length and appreciatively about the book, specifically in terms of heritage. Of course, I do not doubt that the reception of the book was affected by the name of my esteemed friend the historian Ra'uf 'Abbās on the jacket as editor.

To sum up this rather incomplete discussion, in my view the social crisis created by neoliberalism in Egypt is forcing a rethinking of modern history. Had this book appeared in the 1960's, it would have fared much more poorly. Nasirism induced people to see the country as Cairo versus the countryside, as Arabs against non-Arabs. A work merging Arab and Turk and introducing regionalism would have been difficult. (See footnote 12 in this regard.) I would like to make one other observation. The Arab world is very rich in heritage, and every country republishes some of it. Egypt is the major center of this activity by far, not only of publication itself but of the consumption of it. Arguably, this is a further indication of the "Italian Road." Egypt is currently the only Arab country in the Italian Road. For a cultural and civilizationalist review from Italy itself, see the review of the Middle East specialist Mirella Galletti *Nord Sud* (Dec. 11, 1981).

Gabriel Baer's Review

The late historian Gabriel Baer, the leading Israeli specialist in Egyptian history, differed from De Jong in being prepared to concede the importance of Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār. Baer could not, however, concede the idea of meaningful social change in Egypt except as coming ultimately from the West. Al-'Aṭṭār was like al-Jabartī, an isolated genius in a dark age. What was anathema to Baer was the hypothesis that social change leading in the direction of a modern capitalist state and society resulted from a convergence of factors, some of which were internal. In his review of my book, as in his other writings, Baer remained committed to the idea of change equalling the coming of the West. For him, there was no Egyptian dynamic. He was thus quite critical of the whole line of thought presented in chapter one

concerning the way a capitalist initiative was wrested from the Egyptian Muslims and Christians by the Syrians in the late eighteenth century. As alliances changed and as the world market opened up, I had argued that new elements arose in the ruling circles allowing that power to be exercised in new ways. As the reader will discover the book focuses on one such example of the usage of power, the changing consumption patterns of the rulers. When wealthy Egyptian consumers turned abroad for foreign items—where previously they had relied on local Egyptian ones—the position of the local Egyptian artisans who produced these items weakened. It was quite easy, a few years later, for Muḥammad ‘Alī to draft huge numbers of these now unemployed artisans and to force others into agriculture, a move which would have been unthinkable under ‘Alī Bey. However, Baer did not find class conflict in Egypt; he saw no relation between class consumption patterns and politics. Baer also doubted that the guilds changed in this period because he had found in his own work on the guilds some evidence of continuity throughout the nineteenth century. At least, he kept on finding references to the word for guild, *Ḥīraf*. Given a certain attraction to philology, for Baer this meant that the *Ḥīraf* he understood as existing in the eighteenth century kept on existing in the same form because the same word was being used right to the end of the nineteenth century. When André Raymond wrote that the same *métiers* existed, Baer understood this as confirming his presumption of continuity. What did Baer make of Lane’s description from this period of men lying on the ground as a horse rode over them or enduring the eating of hot nails? He must simply have reasoned that these men were not artisans but *Ṣūfis* and that *Ṣūfis* are different from the rest of us. He, of course, rejected my notions of class death.

Baer also appears to reject both the transition to capitalism under Muḥammad ‘Alī and the importance of the commercial sector, of commercialization. In addition, he missed the point (made very directly on page 115) that the ruling class in 1830 was composed in part of members of the Chamber of Commerce, implying a continuation of the shift in capitalism to the minority community carrying over from the late eighteenth century. It is this shift that explains the rise of the city of Alexandria and the importance of the Delta for Egyptian *Ṣūfis* in this later period (as they had lost out in Cairo, as De Jong in a more opaque way showed in his book). In fact, any reference to the incipient rise of capitalism met with a critical comment. The reference to wage labor (111) to which Baer objected is explained in context as referring to the government’s paying of wages—an important point!

Baer’s approach to the subject of culture shows a similar preoccupation with disproving the possibility that change brought about by indigenous forces was taking place. In commenting on this part of the book, Baer raised the subject of culture in the sixteenth and seventeenth century. He insisted that, given how little we know about culture in this period we cannot determine whether what the eighteenth century produced was a revival or not. In addition, he contended that my main source—and source of evi-

dence for this point—the Azhar manuscript catalog, should not be taken too seriously as older manuscripts were more likely to be lost. Hence, for Baer, the presence at this point in time of more writing for the eighteenth than for the seventeenth century does not mean anything.

Given all his profound reservations about possible changes in material conditions, it is not surprising that Baer found the idea of a *ḥadīth* revival linked to middle-class empiricism in the 1770's eclipsed by social changes leading to the resurgence of a landlord-based *fiqh* in the early nineteenth century to be a reductionist one. Given that the idea of change in general bothered him, it is not surprising that what I term the birth and development of neoclassicism served as the example of where Baer wanted to draw the line. Perhaps he realized that a discussion of neoclassicism would eventually impact on the interpretation of late nineteenth-century Egyptian literature and that this would change the paradigm of the West as modernizing Arabic culture.

In arguing his case, obviously Baer would not try to rely on the field of social history to back him up, as today in a vast number of countries in the world—as I indicated at the outset of this essay—one expects social historians to follow roughly the approach I followed. For social historians today, it is quite conventional—as I wrote in the text here—to find, as I did, that from the late eighteenth century onward there was a growth of capitalism and of national participation in the world market.

But fortunately for Baer there is still philology for the study of the Middle East. Philology is, not surprisingly, Baer's approach. In his review of my book in the *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 25/2 (1982): 217–222, (as with De Jong's) much of the intensely critical sentiment becomes distilled in discussions of transliteration. I would, nonetheless, like to state for the record that I benefitted from Baer's and De Jong's skills in this area and I appreciate the effort they went to in their reviews.

Introduction to the Original Edition

This study seeks to redefine the relationship between the West and the Middle East in both cultural and material terms, using the industrial revolution as the period of concentration. It is an attempt at the reconstruction of knowledge. Traditional studies of Western civilization contain an implicit conception of Oriental civilization as an "Other." Thus Western definitions of its own civilization and of the civilization of the Orient have been developed through a series of positive and negative statements. On the one hand, Westerners see themselves as rational, democratic, and voluntaristic; while on the other, they perceive the Oriental as mystical, autocratic, and fatalistic.

This framework of perceiving Self and Other posits a nondialectical movement of culture; that is, history is perceived to be an undifferentiated totality in which there are no overlapping or interpenetrating areas of influence. European scholars have often argued that, in the Middle Ages, Europe merely received Hellenistic culture from the Arabs in toto, while in the modern period the Arabs received modern European culture in toto. Gustave Von Grunebaum, the well-known Orientalist, for instance, defined Islamic civilization as the brief period in which it embodied a form of Hellenism; this was the period between the ninth and eleventh centuries when the West was still barbarous, that is, still ignorant of Greek culture—a situation that was quickly reversed by the famous medieval European translation movement in which Greek classics were first translated into Arabic, then Arabic into Latin. Thereafter, Islam, its élan gone, was thought to be left in an existence alien and apart from civilization.

The most significant consequence of this kind of reasoning is the belief that the rise of the West implies a decline of an "Other." This model of cultural study crystallized in the early colonial period, 1750–1850. Logically, this dichotomous view takes precedence over the traditional mandate of the discipline of history, which is to explain actual change. The result has been the persistence of the simplistic notion that the course of Western history has been on the rise while that of Islamic and Arab history during the pre-nineteenth-century period has been on the decline. The theory of rise and decline has had negative consequences for the study of history. In order to sustain this view, a number of countries (Ireland, Greece, Portugal, and Spain, along with portions of the Baltic and Scandinavian countries) had to be dropped from the conventional curriculum of European studies, and various periods in the most representative societies had to be disposed of in a similar manner. The overriding theme of decline accounts for the cultural

and material life of the Islamic world being considered unimportant or simply ignored and for outstanding figures from the region being cast into the role of "geniuses in a dark age."

This theory of rise and decline has never produced adequate paradigms for the study of the long centuries separating the Arab Golden Age of the tenth century and the modernization of the nineteenth century. Moreover, this model seems incompatible with our understanding of the nature of the social and economic relations between Europe and the Arab world. Trade was always important to both sides. As the West began to industrialize, it became increasingly dependent on cheap sources of food and raw goods as well as markets. The type of market which the industrial world required would not have come into existence without transformations in the countries of the Third World—the creation of new social classes and the mutation of old ones. Forces that opposed the industrial revolution from within Europe might well have gained the upper hand and blocked further development, particularly in France and other continental countries whose overseas options were much more limited in the late eighteenth century than those of Great Britain. Therefore, I contend that the non-Western regions collaborating in the larger social transformation of the late eighteenth century had indigenous roots for their own modern capitalist cultures, formed through processes of indigenous struggle and in some form of struggle with the European part of the system. I am convinced that, properly understood, the industrial revolution was a global event, and I question the strong tradition in the West to assume a proprietary relationship to it. This study seeks to examine these propositions through a detailed examination of the cultural and material life of Egypt, 1760–1840, in its international context.

Specifically, this is the study of the development of Egypt from the beginning of the impact of the industrial revolution to the defeat of the attempts of the indigenous ruling class to resist Western penetration and domination leading it to join in a loose set of dependent working relations. This study of Egypt between 1760 and 1840 is based on primary materials gathered in Egypt. It owes its inception to a reading of a series of articles written by Professor Afaf Marsot of UCLA in the 1960's. These articles made me aware of a contradiction between the generally held assumptions of centuries of unmitigated decline in al-Azhar, the famous mosque center in Cairo, and the reality of a too rapid creation, after the coming of the West, of a generation of students who could easily learn French, translate literature and medical textbooks, and participate creatively in a new economic infrastructure. This feeling of discomfort with the conventional framework grew when I found that the principal reform-minded figures were also prolific figures in what are usually called the traditional religious fields. In addition, I found upon surveying manuscript catalogs that the total number of books and the range of subjects covered appeared to be vastly greater in the later eighteenth century than in the well-known reform period of Muhammad 'Ali in the nineteenth century. The result of my reading a number

of these manuscripts in traditional religious fields was the cardinal discovery that the title, often a gloss, was only in limited ways suggestive of the contents. It has been the common assumption of scholars to dismiss glosses as derivative by definition. No one has guessed that in the eighteenth century they disguised a new body of thought. Disguise is not a bad way of putting it, as invariably these works state that their major purpose is to clarify some earlier work or to expand on some well-accepted points. In fact these statements of self-justification were often followed by a most unexpected introduction of secular cultural matters in the midst of a religious subject. The repeated discovery of this among eighteenth-century books ultimately led to the hypothesis tested in this work that important developments in secular culture were taking place and these were supportive of capitalism.

What was the reason for this vast outpouring? Certainly it was not attributable merely to the development of new knowledge or even of polemical exchange, although these played a role. An explanation could only be found in the larger social historical context. The '*ulamā*' of al-Azhar (a group of scholars) found themselves in the middle of the commercial revival of eighteenth-century Cairo which was threatening to tear the society apart. A number of the prominent '*ulamā*' sponsored a revival of *Ṣūfī ṭuruq* (mystical confraternities) and pioneered methods of cross-class communication, trying to stabilize the lower classes, who were beginning to rebel as their situation deteriorated. I found that the '*ulamā*' were central to the formation of culture. Their works taken as a whole have a logic firmly rooted in class structure. The *Ṣūfī ṭuruq* to which the '*ulamā*' belonged were a main locus of cultural production and were the institutions which mirrored the processes of social change which Egypt experienced during this period. This was true exclusively for the eighteenth century; in the nineteenth century the *ṭuruq* gradually gave way to the reform institutions of the new bureaucracy.

How is the conventional picture of eighteenth-century Egypt in culture or economy to be reconciled with the views expressed here? First, supposedly, there was stagnation, then overrapid industrialization, and finally international debt. During the eighteenth century, most studies tell us, there was a decline in payments of tribute to Istanbul, and Upper Egypt broke away from Cairo. In 1798, Napoleon attempted some reforms and succeeded in registering private property, but with his departure chaos ensued. The rise to power of Muḥammad 'Alī in 1805 inaugurated a period of reform and a rise in national income from the sale of cotton. However, Muḥammad 'Alī squandered this income on unproductive wars and industrialization projects. Finally, Khedive Isma'il's extravagance led to the financial problems of the mid-nineteenth century. Such studies, with their discontinuities in time and their apparent lack of any meaningful pattern as a result of their dynastic, racial, or ethnic foci, have dominated the historiography of modern Egypt.

The same events can be situated in a more integrated framework. Travel literature, consular reports, and general works on economic history suggest that toward the middle of the eighteenth century France became increasingly interested in Egypt as source of grain, especially to supply the region of Marseilles. Egypt also became attractive to France as a market for her finished goods. It is at this point that the modern world market began to have a direct impact. This impact fostered a commercial revival and encouraged growth of a new and increasingly non-Egyptian class directing an export-oriented economy.

The period of Muḥammad 'Alī is thus basically a continuation of trends which began in the eighteenth century not a rupture with some millennial past. The capitalist sector grew but became increasingly dominated by Mediterranean commercial minorities which in liaison with the royal family were able to control the state. Egypt briefly retained economic and de facto political autonomy which it had enjoyed in the later Ottoman period. This opportunity was largely the result of international rivalries and of English politics of the 1820's and early 1830's, which discouraged Great Britain from exercising the economic and political influence on Egypt of which she was capable. When the rise of Muḥammad 'Alī's power threatened the Ottoman Empire, which Great Britain considered to be a barrier to Russian expansion, Muḥammad 'Alī was quickly broken. The Treaty of London of 1840-41 destroyed the monopoly system on which Egypt's development depended. The development of Egyptian monoculture, dominated by a large landowning class dependent on England, was thereafter a foregone conclusion.

The phases of the cultural revival termed neoclassical broadly followed socioeconomic change. In the first phase, a revival in *ḥadīth* (the studies of the sayings of the Prophet) accompanied and in important ways justified the activities of the commercial sector of the eighteenth century. In the second phase, there was a decline of *ḥadīth* studies and a rise in the study of *kalām* (speculative theology), which was used to justify the reform policies of Muḥammad 'Alī. Finally, there was a return to *ḥadīth* after the breakup of Muḥammad 'Alī's reformist bureaucracy. Each period also had a set of characteristic cultural institutions. In the phase of merchant capital, this institution was the *majlis* (salon) of the reform-minded Ṣūfī *ṭuruq*, the Wafā'iya and the Bakriya; in the phase of state commercial dominance, it was the printing press, the newspaper, and the translation bureaus. In the agrarian capitalist phase, it was the state school system.

The analysis of the eighteenth century concentrates on fields which were closest to *ḥadīth* studies: history, literature, and the philological sciences. These fields underwent great development characterized by the editing of texts and the study and emulation of classical models. Many of the models were drawn from the Mulūk al-Ṭawa'if period of Andalusia and other medieval Islamic societies in which the commercial sector had played an important role. In the second phase, attention shifts to those fields which were

important to the study of *kalām*: logic, argumentation, medicine, and the natural sciences. These fields enjoyed a local revival. They also continued to merge with various larger trends in science, as Europe, especially Mediterranean Europe, continued to evolve in the early industrial age.

The study of the development of culture in Egypt disclosed that the actual process of the development and reproduction and addition to that culture depended to a large extent on the interaction between the various centers of the Ottoman Empire, notably Damascus and Istanbul. Scholars traveled from place to place in the course of pilgrimages and trade and they studied in the various places they visited. This activity resulted from the different course of development of the raw-goods-producing periphery of the world market in contrast to the industrial center; in the culture of a city on the periphery a single modality of logic dominated a given center, influencing all the cultural production of a given period. For this reason, it is necessary to explore and develop at some length life in the centers other than Cairo as they form collectively a nexus. I have called this a *de facto* division of labor in the production of culture. This hypothesis facilitates the study of Šūfi orders, the crucial cultural institutions. I found that the Khalwatīya, an order spread through several countries of the Ottoman lands, while bound by the tenets of their most illustrious progenitors, were influenced by the more concrete activities in the societies in which they found themselves. While they were loyal to their confreres, across the Islamic world, the Istanbul Khalwatīya were concerned with the problems of the Ottoman elite and had a widely different position on theological and cultural questions from their counterparts in Damascus. The study of the life of a leading Egyptian intellectual, Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār al-Khalwatī, serves to clarify some of these processes.

Hasan al-ʿAṭṭār's formation in eighteenth-century Egypt, his travels to study in Damascus and Istanbul, and his return to high positions in Muḥammad ʿAlī's government serve to link eighteenth-century Egypt to nineteenth-century Egypt and Egypt to the larger Arabic-language Ottoman culture of his time.

Notes on Method

In this study, I found it useful to employ a series of terms which require a new type of index to help the reader. I find that such terms as *fiqh* or *ḥadīth* or *uṣūl al-fiqh*, which specialists know, must be redefined to convey the sense in which I found these subjects studied, thereby to escape from a misplaced staticness of definitions drawn from the seventh or the eighth century of our era and projected thereafter to cover the development of knowledge one thousand years later. Other terms which most specialists will feel less strongly about, such as the terms classicism and neoclassicism, but which have an assigned place in the study of the literature I find

likewise to be both indispensable and in need of a redefining. For the general reader who has progressed this far, a short effort to explain some main concepts may be helpful.

The basic idea in Western Islamic studies that post-Caliphate orthodox Sunni culture (post A.D. 1250) was a dry scholastic derivative enterprise on the whole simplistic is here challenged by the claim that this is both misguided in a very fundamental sense and self-serving. To begin afresh to enter into the writings of the period of the eighteenth century, one must accept the idea of the '*ulamā*' as intimately involved in a period of momentous societal change which they interpreted and understood. The conclusions which they expressed in writing in one or more of the traditional fields studied here demonstrate this and show how different segments of the eighteenth-century '*ulamā*' were aligned with and intellectually predisposed to defend either the commercial system in its unequal struggle with Western merchants, or the nascent landlord system especially after 1790, or the fate of the artisanate. This social context is a crucial component of the methodology for the study of culture and not merely a conclusion among many. The vast outpouring of books of the period came about because of this involvement. It is therefore crucial to read books, whether on grammar or in *kalām*, for what they tell us about the eighteenth century in which they were composed, to read them in the order in which they were written. I thus follow the development of the writer across the bounds of any given subject. Further, I take each work seriously. His decision to ignore or dismiss the classical rendition of a subject is approached as a problem of why. A brief survey of the works in the mosque available to him and of the high intellectual achievements demonstrated by the leading '*ulamā*' of this supposedly dark age disabuses one of the ancient prejudice that ignorance accounts for abandoning classical models. A closer look suggests that what is taken from the past is self-consciously adopted in the eighteenth century, and this accounts for my claim, after giving many examples, that the eighteenth century saw the birth of neoclassicism in culture—not the mid-nineteenth century as is usually thought. In this respect the intellectual life of Cairo differs from that of Istanbul and Damascus which retained a late classicism in this period.

For Egypt in this period, *uṣūl al-dīn* (the roots of jurisprudence) represented the locus of ideological struggle for legitimizing different economic and social orientations. Again this is not included as a conclusion so much as to point out that the prevailing idea that the roots of jurisprudence exist as levels of reinforcement of a single doctrinal and social position is mistaken. *Ḥadīth* conflicts with *fiqh* not just in terms of what it rationalizes but in its epistemology. Thus, *ḥadīth* studies served the merchants and their need to justify profit in the eighteenth century within an orthodox framework. Philosophically, the collection of sound *ḥadīth* represented an orientation toward a truth which could be computed in such a way as to retain marginal qualitative distinctions. *Fiqh*, or systematic theology based on Aristotelian logic, not merely in practice justified the land system but

approached the problem of justification in terms of universals and particulars, a structure of logic difficult to use in the particularistic relations of merchant and artisan, but suitable for the remote and abstract relations of administrator and peasant. These relations changed as the study progressed into the nineteenth century and therefore the particular conclusions cannot be generalized. What can be suggested is that the roots of jurisprudence contain at a given time in a given place an orthodox hegemony, which embodied within itself oppositional modes. The traditional idea of orthodox opposed by some remote Şūfi opposition must be sharply modified to appreciate this complex structure.

I claim that the study of culture is an integral part of the study of society and its dynamics. And this poses great difficulties for this book. There is no study of the mode of production in Ottoman Egypt. The efforts in recent years to study the Egyptian countryside have not been entirely successful. The study of Ottoman Cairo has however demonstrated that it provided half or more of the tax revenues coming to the central government. In this context, I decided to concentrate on the commercial sector and its internal class struggle. This choice is dictated by the belief, for which a lot of evidence exists, in the large role of early modern Mediterranean trade in promoting the transformations taking place in Egypt. Future studies will pick up the struggle of the rich peasant and will investigate the writings of al-Şiddiqi, a chronicler of the early seventeenth century who referred to the early seventeenth century as the period of the second Ottoman conquest of Egypt. At this point, it is possible to portray the struggles within the Egyptian commercial sector and to see at least the broad outline of the agrarian struggle.

Chapter 1

The Social and Economic History of Egypt, 1760–1815: A Study in Merchant Capital and Its Transformation

This chapter presents a socioeconomic interpretation of Egyptian history from 1760 to 1815. In the middle of the eighteenth century, the commercial revival which had received its impetus from the profits of the transshipment of coffee in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries reached its peak and began to decline, only to be sustained and transformed by changes in the economic structure of Europe and in the development of the world market.¹ This chapter deals with the changes affecting Egypt on two levels: on the global level and within Egypt itself. In so doing, I contest the view that the origins of modern Egypt are to be found in the Napoleonic invasion. While I do not dispute the importance of European influence either in economics or in culture, I wish to argue the thesis that modern Egyptian culture has a coherent indigenous basis, and that this basis is rooted in social and economic changes which took place in the middle and late eighteenth century. In this chapter, I shall lay the groundwork for this thesis.

Trade (i.e., the international distribution of goods) took place throughout the history of medieval Egypt and included trade with Europe. Commercial revivals came and went. They permitted a few of the most successful merchants in different epochs to join the landholding aristocratic class. Trade was not transformative; it did not lead to a destruction of the guilds, to the uprooting of peasants, or, in short, to a capitalist transformation. This began to take place later and was due to a constellation of forces, some internal to the Ottoman Empire, such as the Porte's declining influence on Egypt, and others related to the progress of the industrial revolution in western Europe. The industrial revolution created a new type of goods and a market structure to sell them. There were also, of course, factors internal to Egypt which accounted for the breakdown of the Ottoman military corps which had been created in the sixteenth century.

The early 1760's mark two important events, one external, one internal, which serve to demarcate the beginning of our period. The external event is the conflict between England and France (1758–1763) during the Seven Years' War. The result of this war was a great setback for France: she lost much of her vast overseas empire and was shown to be weak on the seas. France turned to sources of raw goods closer at hand than those of the New World, including Egypt and North Africa. The internal event is the rise of

the Mamlūk Beylicate, a semi-independent configuration of warriors with a strong commercial orientation, which marks the decline of the older Ottoman military caste system. The conjunction of these two factors accounts in large measure for the fate of the indigenous middle classes and the artisans whose religious and cultural life will be explored in the second and third chapters.

French involvement in Egypt, through its merchants' community, missionaries, and local minority groups, was an opening wedge for the expanded penetration of foreign capital into Egypt in the eighteenth century. I shall treat the social changes in Egypt which resulted from the impact of this penetration in conjunction with the evolution of internal forces.

The treatment of the upper classes focuses on the breakdown of the military castes, their entry into commerce, and their rivalries among themselves and with the European minorities. This chapter discusses merchant capital and its transformation to highlight the nature of commercial organization in this period and the growing impact which this capitalist sector had on the fabric of medieval society as a result of pressure of the world market.

We next study the middle classes and how by the end of the eighteenth century a small segment of the middle class was propelled upward into the landowning class, while the majority were depressed. From a study of the guilds and artisans, I have determined that, while their membership grew during the eighteenth century, their essential character changed for a number of reasons in the direction of wage labor. It is in this sense that we can speak of their decline, linked to market conditions.

Finally, we survey the Delta. In this region, the demand for rice and wheat was accelerating the trend toward monetarization and even, in isolated instances, toward a capitalist agriculture.

We begin with a brief discussion of the rise of Europe and the world market.

The Birth of the Modern World Market

By the end of the fifteenth century, European hegemony began to become apparent with the beginning of the successful expansion of European commerce to far-flung parts of the globe. Ocean voyages led to the conquest of the Americas and gradually to the overcoming of the obstacle or counter-pressure of the Ottoman Empire, which had preserved a large share of world trade in Africa and Asia.² Europeans succeeded in Asian trade, not through superiority in commercial ability or organizational skill, but through use of superior weaponry. Their ships were strong enough to mount cannon effectively, and with them they could cripple other trading vessels. The effective use of naval artillery led to the setting up of coastal forts along the trade routes, thereby increasing the degree of control and the profitability of the trade.

The period from the end of the fifteenth century to the middle of the seventeenth was the one in which Asian trade was secondary. This was the period of the heyday of piracy of the mineral wealth of the New World. By the middle of the seventeenth century, the combination of new markets and the flood of gold and goods from the New World had greatly stimulated Western manufactures, contributing to the ascendancy of the bourgeoisie in Europe. With the rise of the middle class in western Europe, plunder ceased to be the most productive economic activity, as it interfered with planned growth. Even domination of trade routes was not profitable unless the trade itself was expanding; and in fact the profits from the East India spice trade declined by the middle of the seventeenth century, just as the flow of precious metals from the New World declined when the richest and most accessible mines became used up and the supply of Indian labor shrank.

The period from the mid-seventeenth century to the late eighteenth century, the period of commercial capitalism *par excellence*, was characterized by intensified rivalry among the leading powers of Europe, all of which sought new markets for their products, all of which needed raw goods. England gradually emerged during this period as the paramount sea power, breaking the Dutch monopoly.³ By the end of the eighteenth century, the commercial expansion which had begun in the last part of the fifteenth century definitely appeared threatened. As Eric Hobsbawm has shown, in the second half of the eighteenth century even the prosperity of the triangular trade had begun to dry up.⁴ The declining profitability of the colonies led to a renewed outbreak of warfare among the major powers in the mid-eighteenth century. In the Seven Years' War, France lost nearly the whole of her empire, while England doubled hers and gained concessions which opened up the road to India. The final confrontation between these two great powers took place during the Napoleonic Wars (1793-1815), which ushered in the Pax Britannica of the nineteenth century. The victory of England in the Napoleonic Wars led to a historical epoch of global dominance on an unprecedented scale. Dominion over the seas permitted Britain to colonize either directly or indirectly, or even to favor local independence movements, as in Latin America.

It was during the late eighteenth century that the commercial revolution gave way, first in England and then in other western European countries, to the industrial revolution. At home this meant a gradual decline of the royal companies and the growing power of the chambers of commerce, as in Marseilles or Manchester. Abroad, it meant new economic demands. Not only did the Europeans seek such products as sugar, spice, and slaves, as in the preceding epoch, but they also increasingly placed an emphasis on raw materials to be processed (cotton, oilseeds, dye stuffs, jute, metals, and food for the growing urban populations). The pressure within the European system and the availability of the technology led to attempts to capture control of capitalist sectors in African and Asian countries and to expand them.

During the eighteenth century, the Arabs of the Middle East felt the

effects of the second wave created by the outward expansion of European commerce. The first impact had come at the end of the fifteenth century or shortly thereafter, when the Europeans rounded the Cape of Good Hope and gradually increased their dominance of the spice trade; probably this was a factor in the general economic standstill of the region in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Direct English interest in the Arab countries and Egypt arose as a result of the expansion, in the eighteenth century, of the British East India Company. The growing British involvement in India, a region in which the French were already established, created a need for rapid communication as never before. Thus, affairs in Egypt, Syria, and Iraq became a matter of concern.⁵ The British had previously depended on the Persian Gulf–Baghdad–Aleppo route, but this was increasingly uncertain because of the “instability” of the Pashalik of Baghdad and the raids of the neighboring Bedouins. An alternative route for the British was the Red Sea–Egypt route which ran through a shorter Bedouin-controlled stretch between Suez and Cairo. In 1768, ‘Alī Bey, the leading Mamlūk, seemed inclined toward trade and cooperation when the Scottish explorer James Bruce visited Cairo. Bruce’s suggestions concerning the use of this route also interested the merchant community of Alexandria, and they lent their support, as did the British sea captains who found the Red Sea trade in a state of decay and thought that they might sell Bengal goods in the bazaars of Cairo. The East India Company and the Sultan, however, opposed it. The Porte was naturally concerned about the loss of revenue from the Hijāz region if trade should be diverted from Jidda to Suez; and the Company, on the defensive against free trade, was also reluctant “to have prohibited goods reach the Mediterranean.”

Thus, when the British sought to send merchandise from Calcutta to Suez in 1774, the Sharif of Mecca violently protested. The Turkish merchant community, which feared the loss of its Basra and Aleppo trade, strongly backed him. The Porte issued a firman banning this trade.⁶

It was not, however, merely concern for the Porte which deterred the British from establishing themselves more deeply in Egypt. Such involvement was also unprofitable. In Egypt, as in many other parts of the Levant, French cloth sold much better than English woollens. After 1750, English sales in Egypt dwindled to a mere twenty-five bales a year. In 1754 the Levant Company, England’s representative in the Middle East, decided to withdraw to Cyprus, thus officially giving up, although for individuals who stayed, trade revived between 1757 and 1773.⁷

The Failure of French Agriculture: Search for an Overseas Solution, 1750–1815

France was the major power involved in Egypt and the other Arab countries during the second half of the eighteenth century, England’s commitments

were elsewhere. What was France seeking in Egypt? What impact did France have on Egypt during this period?

It will be recalled that France was decidedly weaker than England and that after the Seven Years' War she did not control overseas colonies; thus, she had fewer options for procuring raw materials and for marketing her manufactured products. In addition, France had a problem which England did not. Since she lacked control of the seas, a mounting urban population created for her a growing problem of inadequate food supply, especially in the south of France.⁸

In fact, it is not an exaggeration to say that France, in contrast to England, underwent a structural evolution in the eighteenth century which delayed the modernization of her agricultural sector and made her increasingly dependent on food imports in the late eighteenth century as the country became increasingly urbanized and mounted an army for war. This is clearly reflected in the nature of her trade with Egypt and would seem to have carried some weight in the risky decision to invade Egypt in 1798. A half-century of frustration in Egypt, combined with growing needs at home, created and sustained the hope that the destruction of the Mamlūk regime would break the monopoly which the Mamlūks held on the grain trade. If the French could gain access, it might even be enlarged by the introduction of some French production methods.

French agriculture at the beginning of the eighteenth century was dominated by royal absolutism. "The French landed upper classes adapted to the gradual intrusion of capitalism by putting greater pressure on the peasants, meanwhile putting them in a situation approaching *de facto* ownership."⁹ This was because the impulse toward commercial agriculture had from the beginning of the century been weaker in France than in England, and not only among the French nobility. The problem of getting grain to the city was correspondingly greater in France than in England. The grain trade in France presented a picture of stagnation, broken by an impulse toward production for the market in the neighborhood of the big cities. There the wealthier peasants rather than the landed aristocracy appear to have been the main beneficiaries. The former were able to pass the costs of transportation on to the merchants. The early part of the century in particular was characterized by profiteering merchants who scoured the countryside to buy up food goods from the wealthy peasants. But later in the eighteenth century, aristocratic disdain for commercial agriculture did not hinder the nobility, especially in the Diocese of Toulouse, from making large profits in the grain trade. The incentive to grow grain was greater in southern France because of the rising population; local political pressures led to an improvement in transportation. However, unlike the English nobility, the French nobility who were involved in agriculture in the eighteenth century did not introduce any technological innovations.¹⁰ Possibly the system of seigneurial obligation was an obstacle to technological change; possibly it was contrary to the interests of the rich peasants.

The end of the eighteenth century was marked by a long series of grain crises which, as can be seen from the preceding analysis, were clearly related to the failure of capital penetration into the French countryside—an aspect of the relative indifference of the French aristocracy to do more than live off their rents. Toulouse was the singular exception; here, however, the orientation toward increased marketing was related not to increased production but rather to a greater emphasis on medieval dues which the peasant had to pay. By the end of the eighteenth century, a vigorous reform movement had developed. The physiocrats were well aware of what was needed for agricultural reform, and as the grain crises continued, their number and influence grew at court. One particularly severe crisis occurred during the interval from 1787 to 1789, just prior to the outbreak of the Revolution. "A decree of 1787 removed restrictions on the grain trade, including those requiring the cultivators to bring their grain to the local markets. The harvest in the autumn of 1788 was disastrously short. The winter that followed was unusually harsh, while spring brought severe storms and floods. Natural disasters combined with political uncertainties and anxieties by the summer of 1789 to set off a series of panics and peasant uprisings in many parts of France."¹¹ Where the food problem was most acute, in the south, even the wealthy urban merchants supported the Gironde party and sought the Restoration.¹²

Agricultural reform began for the first time in 1794, when the disruptions created by the wartime situation helped the reformers to a certain extent in getting around the seigneurial system. However, in October 1795, inflationary pressure which was closely related to the price of bread led to revolts, the leadership of which was provided by the wealthy merchants.¹³

As the eighteenth century progressed, a relationship developed between French grain insufficiency and her trade policy of importing grain from wherever it could be found. It is clear that, by the end of the century, Marseilles was in a state of virtual dependence on foreign sources of grain. Egypt was a potential granary, although prior to the Seven Years' War this had not been the case. In fact, before the middle of the century, little can be deduced about the significance of French imports from the Middle East. Rather, the emphasis in a French consul's report of 1748 seems to be one of satisfaction with the great improvement in the sale of French cloth there. Whereas in the 1720's only the nobles could afford to buy it, now all the well-off families were able to purchase it, and the *beys* were dressing their slaves in it.¹⁴

Here the major concern was still that luxury goods might not find a broad enough market. This fear was put to rest by the phenomenon (which will be discussed below) of the sustained revival of the middle classes in Egypt. But by the 1760's, it is possible to detect a new and enlarged French involvement in Egypt. The direction this took is clear. Rather suddenly, France developed a local client community to carry on its trade. The support which France gave this group of traders, who were Christians and recent immigrants from Syria, permitted them to unseat the Egyptian Jewish community from its control of the lucrative *iltizām* (tax farm) of the customs *dīwān*.

The Egyptian Jewish community had received the nominal support of Venice. The principal support which France was able to give by virtue of her trade position was consular protection to merchants of her choice. This *beratli* status in turn gave the bearer an important advantage vis-à-vis the indigenous Muslim merchant community. The *beratli* merchant would pay one-half or less of the customs duties that an indigenous merchant would have to pay. The indigenous merchant community of Egypt was never again able to gain control of its own trade with Europe until the twentieth century.¹⁵ The principal Syrians mentioned as working for the French during this period were Mikhā'il Fakhr and Yūsuf Baytār. In 1769 Fakhr took control of the Alexandria customs, and Yūsuf Baytār took over the Damietta customs. The Venetians immediately lost influence. Fakhr raised the import tariff on Venetian goods from the 3 percent, which was usual for European goods, to 5 percent.

The gross statistics provided by Paul Masson give a picture of rising trade between Egypt and France in mid-century, coinciding with the rise of the Syrians to influence. The Egyptians were purchasing some weaponry but mainly luxury goods; the French were buying mainly raw materials, including rice and wheat.¹⁶ The reasons for the collapse of this trade have been presented in many works as due to Mamlūk misrule, which involved many discriminatory practices leveled against the foreign merchant community. A common example of the grievances which are frequently cited is the breakdown of the harbor facilities in Alexandria.¹⁷ The collapse of the French merchant community did not of course signal the decline of Egyptian exports and French imports. The trade was now passing more and more through the hands of the minorities.

In 1797, a well-informed contemporary witness of Egyptian events, Jean-Baptiste Trécourt, wrote an interesting work on the economy of Egypt.¹⁸ His aim was to discuss the procuring of Egyptian grain, which he foresaw would require political changes in Egypt, changes which France could bring about. Much of his book argues that these changes would greatly benefit the poor people of Egypt. Trécourt's book is highly polemical, but it is nevertheless very informative. He blames what he calls the general impoverishment of the people on the restrictions which the *beys* placed on the exporting of grain! He states that its export without tax was not permitted except to Jiddah and the Sharīf of Mecca, and that when it was permitted to other areas it was only with such "onerous restrictions" that no profits could be realized.¹⁹ In years of privation, Trécourt argues, the ordinary Egyptian goes hungry despite the agricultural richness of his country. Because the cultivator knows that if he were to grow crops destined for local consumption he would receive a low price, there is no incentive for him to grow more than he requires for his own needs. In the event of crop failure, wheat is imported from abroad, and the differential in costs due to transportation and export duties makes it too dear for the poor people to buy it. This is the gist of his argument: widespread misery among the Egyptian people is the result of the Mamlūks' refusal to accept free trade in grain. It is clear from a

close reading that the author was in fact projecting French problems onto Egypt. The problem of having to import grain at high prices was a real one for France but was purely hypothetical in Egypt. He refers to the "famine of 1784" in Egypt, but it is clear that in this year the "misery" came from the plague, not from the fact that the poor could not eat rice or wheat.²⁰ His real interest was in creating a free trade zone in Egypt which would ease the problem of French merchants and their subsidiaries in procuring grain. "The obstacles which I am speaking about are by no means the only ones which indicate the desirability of free grain sales. There is as well in Egypt a very ruinous monopoly, one of the principal consequences of which is to cause fluctuation in prices. I saw in the same year wheat selling for eight and for thirty-six piastres for the ardeb."²¹ As Gaston Wiet remarks in his editorial notes, Trécourt was by no means the only Frenchman to complain about the grain production, which was sometimes even compared to the description given by Pliny of the grain trade.²²

In the 1790's, economic restrictions imposed by the Revolutionary government in Paris made the local French trade situation even more difficult. In the summer of 1793, the Convention laid an embargo on the export of French goods and forbade the transmission of funds to foreign countries, thus making payment for imports impossible. In June 1793, the British declared grain and raw materials to be contraband of war. By September of 1793, France was almost cut off from world trade.²³ This almost certainly underlay the famous "vexations" of French merchants and is generally alleged to be one of the justifications of the Napoleonic invasion of Egypt in 1798. On the one hand, there was the fact that Egyptian wheat fed southern France; on the other hand, the French merchant community was unable to pay for the wheat.²⁴ This may explain, for example, the events of April 1794, when Ibrāhīm Bey "extorted" 14,000 patâques (!!) and subsequently pillaged French merchants' supplies, which led to their decision to leave Cairo.²⁵ Charles Magellon, the most experienced and most famous member of the French merchant community, returned to Paris and devoted himself to lobbying for an invasion of Egypt. Addressing the Commissioner of Foreign Relations in October 1795, he stressed the great value of Egyptian cereals and rice to France in those years in which the French harvest should be poor. After dwelling on the "tyranny" of the *beys* in yet another work, a *Mémoire sur l'Égypte* (February 1798), addressed to Talleyrand, he went on to describe the commercial and agricultural possibilities if France were to capture Egypt. The *Mémoire* included an estimate of the military expenditures required in such an operation.²⁶ This *Mémoire* appeared a year after the last diplomatic effort by France in Egypt, the Thainville Mission, which sought release of or recompense for a cargo of cloth which the head of the Egyptian customs had seized in March 1797. This mission ended in failure, and a year later the French sent an invading army. From all this it is quite clear not only that France had an objective need for grain, but also that a lobby existed in France composed of merchants and diplomats who, along with manufacturers from the south, pressured the French government to

become involved. These groups desired to improve their situation in Egypt, but there were also in the background hopes of regaining France's position in India, which had been greatly weakened in the Seven Years' War. In the section below on the period from 1798 to 1815, emphasis will be placed on the almost single-minded concern with these issues, which continued to be paramount.

Egypt in 1760

What was the nature of the society which attracted France and which ultimately justified an overseas invasion at a time when France did not dominate the seas? The hypothesis developed here is that Egypt was a weak tributary formation. It was weak in the sense that the extraction of ground rent depended on the central government, and not on a seigneurial presence. It was weak in the sense that the reproduction of the system depended on the active cooperation of the rich peasants, who had to ensure the day-to-day maintenance of agriculture. Finally, it was vulnerable vis-à-vis Europe in the sense that its commercial sector, which was confined largely to the city of Cairo, was disproportionately large. This precapitalist commercial sector from Ayyūbid times to the early seventeenth century performed the functions of distribution and financing for the ruling class; thereafter, industry and trade came to account for half or more of the tax revenue and constituted a principal arena of struggle for domination by Mamluks and Janissaries.²⁷

The impact of the western European industrial revolution was to cause the value of agricultural land to rise and to intensify competition in the commercial sector, especially after the arrival of European merchants and Syrian Christians, who served as proxy for French capitalism. The year 1760 marks the date when struggle over distribution of the surplus began to result in a transformation of production. It marks the beginning of a long process in which the commercial sector was wrested from indigenous hands, a process in which other subordinate social formations, slave and tribal, likewise give way as capitalism developed. It is a convenient date to note the decline of pepper, spices, and coffee exports. Their displacement was critical for the city's economy.

The Ruling Class:

Part One—The Mamluk Elite, 1760–1798

The Mamluk *beys* emerged as the political elite in alliance with a number of rich merchants who formed the economic elite after a series of internecine struggles between their rivals, the Janissaries and other feudal military groups. The Janissaries had been deeply involved in trade, and with the decline of coffee as an export commodity, their situation deteriorated in the

early eighteenth century. The *beys*, whose wealth was in land and whose numbers were replenished from distant points, were isolated from the problems of Cairo. Their wealth rose steadily as the value of land rose. The strength of the Mamlūks lay in their alliances with indigenous and foreign merchants, an alliance constituted against the Ottoman presence in Egypt and against its rivals as well. The Mamlūks were able to control both their rivals, whose wealth they confiscated, and the Ottoman administrative apparatus, into whose ranks they introduced their personnel, whose procedures of land registration and taxation they circumvented, and whose chief officers existed only on their sufferance. As a result, the Mamlūks were far wealthier than their predecessors, the Janissaries. As a consequence of wealth and foreign connections, 'Alī Bey, the leading Mamlūk, had access to new technology, especially weaponry.²⁸ This weaponry was extremely expensive in the short run and had a disruptive effect on the society in the long run.

'Alī Bey al-Kabīr became ruler in 1760, that is, Shaykh al-Balad, or the leading Mamlūk *amīr* (sometimes called simply *bey*). He was the first to attempt to work through the foreign merchant community and to attempt to reform key institutions, such as the army, by means of European advisors.²⁹ The Ottoman Pasha's significance was thereby reduced, but he was still a symbol of the legitimacy of the system, and as such a formidable figure. Not only did he possess a great deal of wealth, but it was still necessary that he be welcomed and courted and, if the *beys* found him to be dangerous, removed in a manner which was in no way critical of the Porte, whose personal appointee he was.

A Mr. Lusignan, a contemporary source, gives us a picture of the complexity of the competing economic and political orientations within the ruling class.³⁰ Upon being informed of the arrival of a new Pasha, the Shaykh al-Balad would send a party bearing gifts and spies to see what the Porte's intentions were. If they discovered anything discomfiting, the Shaykh al-Balad would try to force the new Pasha to leave and at the same time write to the would-be Pasha. But, as Lusignan observed, if the Pasha was prudent, he could break the power of the Great Diwān by gaining the affection of the Āghā of the Janissaries, the Kikhyā, and the Shawīsh and playing one *bey* against another, since each one wanted to be Shaykh al-Balad. According to Lusignan, the last Pasha who was able to accomplish this was Rāghib Muḥammad Pasha, the Pasha of Cairo from 1742 to 1749. After him it would seem that no Pasha gained power again, except for short periods when an Ottoman army was in Egypt. The revenue of the Pasha was great in absolute terms, but during the course of the eighteenth century it was continuously being limited by the Mamlūk *beys*.

"During most of the eighteenth century, the governors received an average of 15,000,000 para's from the sales of properties of deceased persons alone [*iltizāms* went as part of the governor's *khāss* revenues] but after 1779 the Mamlūk Amīrs seized this paying the governors an average of 1,500,000 para's."³¹ While sources conflict on some points of detail, it is

clear that the Pasha lost the bulk of the revenues of the customs house tax farm, which was worth some 12 million paras annually, after 1750.³² Other income based on the collection of the *ḥulwān* (annual tribute to the Porte) was also greatly limited by the *beys*, especially after 1779/1193 when Egypt was ruled by Murād and Ibrāhīm.³³ Another loss of revenue to the Ottoman treasury in Egypt which affected the Pasha occurred when the Shaykh of the Hawwāra tribe of Upper Egypt, which had paid Cairo 150,000 ardebs of wheat during the first half of the eighteenth century, ceased to do so after 1769, when the Ṣa'īd (upper Egypt) was in a state of "anarchy." This would seem to have left only the Pasha's minor revenues (e.g., investiture fees of officials, his annual salary from the treasury) free from the inroads of the Mamlūks in the later eighteenth century.³⁴

The decline of the power of the Pasha was not an isolated phenomenon. The Mamlūks dominated all the ruling institutions of the society. Naturally, they sought to infiltrate the financial bureaucracy. In the early eighteenth century, the *efendis* of the financial bureaucracy passed their positions on to their sons, while the positions were tax farms, guild membership and attendance at the schools were nonetheless preconditions to access. Until 1775 the system remained intact; after this time the Mamlūks began to introduce their members into these posts. In 1798, when the French came, Ibrāhīm Efendī and most of his *efendis* and scribes fled to Syria with the *beys*, refusing the bribes offered by Napoleon and showing their loyalty to the Mamlūks.³⁵ Another example of Mamlūk interference in the treasury concerned the Maḥmal (sacred litter). The treasury had paid during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries some 500,000 paras for the costs of the Pilgrimage to Mecca each year from Cairo through Egypt, and this was supplemented by *waqf* funds from the estates deeded by will. After 1775, the *beys* appropriated the funds to themselves. The *kiswa*, or cover, of the Maḥmal became increasingly threadbare, and for the first time Bedouin attacks on the pilgrimage route were a significant problem.

Another example of the breakdown of the system of extraction was a shift in taxation. The rate for those who paid in cash was far below the rate for those who paid in kind. This permitted large, untaxed profits on cash crops and encouraged speculation and the creation of an artificial scarcity.³⁶ Not only did Mamluk capital penetrate the Ottoman financial administration, thereby altering the way in which it functioned, as in taxing, but on occasion it was also able to simply bypass it. One sign of this was the growth of *murattabāt*, which indicated that income was illegally being made into *awqāf* for individuals and institutions at the treasury's expense.³⁷ *Murattabāt* are an indication of an accumulation of capital.

A third important area of Mamluk domination during the second half of the eighteenth century was within the military corps themselves. The seven Ottoman corps had never in practice been of equal strength of wealth, but their intact existence was a foundation stone of the medieval system and was symbolized by their equal representation in the Great Diwān. As Stanford Shaw describes them:

During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the janissaries, 'azab and mutafarriqa corps had the most men, revenue and power, and the others were subordinate to them. In the eighteenth century, as the mamlūk houses took over control of the entire Ottoman system, the corps as such, and the distinctions among them, became much less important, as they all became little more than vehicles for the maintenance and support of the freed mamlūks of the various houses in the mamlūk hierarchy. However, the janissary corps did retain somewhat more of an independent organization, and it usually was the chief weapon of the dominant mamlūk house, whichever house that might be.³⁸

The Janissaries managed to gain part of the customs house revenue which had been taken from the Pasha during the second half of the eighteenth century. They then paid the Pasha a decreasing compensation, pocketing an estimated 25 million paras. Another source of revenue was derived from their work as the police of the city of Cairo. They could accept bribes from the artisans, merchants, and tavern owners and allow them to violate the various laws, and in this way collect an estimated 50 to 2,000 paras a month. The Janissaries also controlled the salt monopoly, which they had seized from the 'Azabs in 1691. During the 1790's it was worth 1.6 million paras annually. Their monopoly of the slaughterhouse tax was worth about a million paras annually at the end of the century. Among the other tax farms which they controlled were the mint and the granary, which they had retained as a consequence of their basic function of policing the city of Cairo and the Citadel.

After the middle of the century, the janissaries and the 'azabs largely replaced the mutafarriqa corps as the principal sources of the new men sent to garrison the provincial fortresses. From the revolt of 'Alī Bey al-Kabīr in 1183/1769–70 until the arrival of the French expedition, the Mamlūk amirs who ruled Egypt based the power of their houses principally on the revenues and positions available to the janissaries and 'azabs, in which they enrolled their men, while the other corps became little more than rewards for members of the janissary and 'azab corps who were members of, or who supported the ruling mamlūk houses.³⁹

From all this it is clear that the role of the Janissaries was subordinate to that of the Mamlūks, although sometimes they were in alliance with them. During the eighteenth century, the 'Azab served mainly as subordinates to the Janissaries who guarded the police stations (*qulluq*) of Cairo. The 'Azab also supplied most of the men for the forts in Upper Egypt; provided guards for the environs of Alexandria, Damietta, Rosetta, and Suez; and manned and guarded the boats sailing on the Nile and in the Delta.⁴⁰ The 'Azab also retained several important tax farms, the one of greatest interest being the Amīn al-Khurda. This tax farm originally (in 1528) controlled public

spectacles and entertainment, but by the late eighteenth century was only important as a way of entry into the guilds of Cairo.⁴¹ This is the first direct evidence of the fate of some of the poorer and more subordinate corps. Their members, some of them undoubtedly Turks, others Egyptians, simply disappeared through intermarriage and economic associations into the indigenous population. A second tax farm retained by the 'Azab, the Amīn al-Baḥrayn, carried with it the right to supervise, regulate, and tax the navigation on the Nile between the "two ports" of Old Cairo and Bulaq. A great deal of Cairo's grain trade passed this way, making it a very important office.⁴²

In the second half of the eighteenth century, then, the Mamlūks were the backbone of the ruling class, a class which also included officials and even some wealthy Egyptians. The question we must answer—and it is a very difficult one—is: Who were the Mamlūks? The answer cannot be given, as it was above, simply in terms of the Mamlūks as a "corps" with their tax farms, because their economic function was now more complicated.⁴³ A standard response to the question of how to identify the Mamlūks has been to try to determine their social background, even though it obviously changed during the half-century on which we are concentrating.

The Mamlūks' social background in the mid-eighteenth century would seem to be well known. The Mamlūks came from territory ruled by Russia until the Empress Catherine prevented their leaving in the 1780's. A body of literature, some of which is discussed below, shows how they retained sympathies and perhaps even stronger links, with Russia. But, as a recent article shows, even during the pre-1780 period, the question of their identity was complicated. During the eighteenth century, the Mamlūk elite created for itself an elaborate mythology about its origins which had little to do with the reality of these origins, or with its professions of loyalty (or disloyalty) to the Ottoman Empire.⁴⁴ As P. M. Holt has shown, it was based on an obviously spurious genealogy which incorporated Egyptian Bedouin and classical Arabian tribal distinctions into Mamlūk history. The struggle between two Mamlūk houses in the eighteenth century, between the white flag (Faḳ-qārī) and the red flag (Qāsimī), was related to a very early tribal conflict between the Tubbā'ī and the Kulaybī, then to the later struggle of the Yamanīs and Yazīdīs and to others from throughout Arab history. Another writer took this creation of spurious genealogy to be evidence of the "assimilation" of the Mamlūk elite into Egyptian society, a blurring of the difference between Mamlūk and non-Mamlūk; he also noted the rapid manumission of "slaves" attached to Mamlūk households which took place in this period.⁴⁵

Undoubtedly, assimilation served a purpose of legitimizing rule as the socioeconomic structure changed. When English orientalist Edward Lane came to Egypt in the early nineteenth century, the distinction between a Turkish official and an Egyptian, even a prosperous one, was still clearly visible in the fact that the former rode a horse and the latter a mule. Lane arrived after the Mamluk period. There is no doubt that legitimacy was a

basic problem which confronted the Mamlūk *beys*. What was the basis of their claim to the loyalty of their members, or the loyalty of the society at large? In the later eighteenth century, when full-grown Mamlūks were being acquired from whatever region would send them, including Europe, traditional ties of a shared familial experience must in any case have been weakened, and ties based on ethnic solidarity were lacking. What then would hold the house together?⁴⁶ The houses were in fact not holding together; this is a corollary to the phenomena of assimilation, manumission, genealogy creation, and so on. Examples of treachery among the *beys*, of one killing another after having been his ally, abound in 'Abd al-Rahman al-Jabartī's account of the eighteenth century and in the European travel books of the period. Yet the system lasted into the first decade of the nineteenth century. There was no rising class within Egypt seeking to destroy it.

The question of what sustained the Mamlūk system before and after the 1780's can to a degree be studied separately. Between the 1760's and the 1780's, a number of sources link the Mamlūks to Russia. 'Alī Bey was a prototype of the first period; Ibrāhīm al-Sannārī was a prototype of the second. During the "Russian period" (1760-1780), one finds a number of examples of Russian aid to the *beys*. One might question to what extent this aid was being given because of sympathy or to what extent Russia was simply interested in encouraging any anti-Ottoman rebellion.⁴⁷ After the 1780's, Mamlūks seemed to come primarily from the Sudan and even from Europe. French sources, reflecting the contemporary Frenchman's fear of the Russian fleet and of Russian diplomatic moves, tend to blur the distinction between Russian sympathy with anti-Ottoman motives and actual ethnic solidarity. Masson wrote that at the instigation of Baron de Thonus, the Russian consul, Murād Bey (who was of Russian origin) dunned the French merchants of 300,000 écus, a large sum, which they were unable to pay. Later, at Russia's behest, Murād demolished the French convent of the Fathers of the Holy Land (Couvent de Pères de la Terre Sainte).⁴⁸ Another French writer showed that in 1785 the Empress Catherine, anticipating war with the Porte, supported the *beys*' claim to independence. The Russian consul in Cairo was on this occasion given elaborate presents. Four years later, in 1789, however, the period of Russian influence was obviously over: Baron de Thonus was assassinated by followers of Isma'il Pasha.⁴⁹

But despite an exaggeration of Thonus' influence with the *beys*, one French writer does indicate quite concretely a way in which this influence may have been exercised: "One quarter of the 'New Houses' are truly Russian. The others are Georgian or Circassian, carry on as well through the Russian consul correspondance with their parents who are known to them and who have had them transmit quite large sums of money in recent times . . . Ibrāhīm Bey, son of a Georgian priest, can remember having served in the mass . . . he has written to the Baron de Thonus asking him to send five hundred Mamlūks and this consul has been charged with the task of convincing the Russian court to agree to this."⁵⁰

The new Mamlūks of the end of the eighteenth century came from di-

verse sources, Africa being the most accessible. Of course, there were many holdovers. Muṣṭafā Āghā served Napoleon because he hated the Mamlūks of the family of Muḥammad Bey Abū Dhahab (Murād and Ibrāhīm), because Murād had killed his old patron, the Āghā 'Abd al-Raḥman.⁵¹ At the very end of the eighteenth century and in the early nineteenth century, a number of Mamlūks were clearly of Greek origin.⁵²

If shared social origin does not explain how the Mamlūks' system survived, then it would be logical to postulate that the household of the *bey* represented during this period a rational unit of endeavor in economic terms or in military terms. A recent study argues that this was indeed the case, but points out that the household was always under strain because it was never quite sufficient. "'Alī Bey (1758-63), who was the first Mamlūk to recruit mercenaries on a large scale, began by seizing his opponent's lands and levying extraordinary taxes on the villages and the merchants and other groups in the towns. One of his successors, Murād Bey (1778-89), tried less short-term methods. He monopolized the customs and then began, forcibly, to purchase a large part of the wheat crop and to sell it for cash at a greatly increased price."⁵³

The expense of hiring mercenaries was one of the chief causes of the economic strains which forced the Mamlūks to adopt short-run expedients to raise money. The mercenaries were of two types: first, the Maghāribā, who if not paid created havoc in the city (rulers, including Napoleon and Muḥammad 'Alī, had to find special roles for them to keep them occupied); second, the European Mamlūks, who ran the navy and manned the cannon, whose service in war was a necessity but who were very expensive to maintain and in addition required expensive equipment. A few examples will make this clear. Among the great military and technical ventures of the late eighteenth century was the creation of a navy by Murād Bey. Using Turkish artisans whom he imported, he constructed several battleships at great cost. The largest of the ships was armed with twenty-four cannon and was moored at Giza in front of his palace. To run the navy, Murād relied on a Greek admiral, Niqlā Ra'īs, and some three hundred Greek marines originally from the Archipelago. Niqlā Ra'īs had previously served in the Ottoman navy and had deserted to the Mamlūks during the invasion of 1786. He was to desert again to Napoleon in 1798. Niqlā had great power over the Mamlūks, who feared the consequences of being cannonaded.⁵⁴ They wanted him to stay because they needed his skills, for even the Europeans had respect for the quality of his artillery.⁵⁵

Murād Bey also depended on the services of three Greek brothers, the Zantiots (Ibrāhīm, Ahmad, and Ḥusayn). Ibrāhīm created an "artillery factory" for Murād Bey near his palace in Giza. Husayn took charge of the artillery itself and took part in the defense of Upper Egypt against General Desaix de Veygoux. Later, however, he defected and served as a diplomat and intermediary between Murād and the French.⁵⁶

As previously stated, the mercenaries had to be well paid for their services, and they also had to be equipped with the necessary technology. For-

unately or otherwise, Egypt possessed the saltpeter for making good gunpowder. This greatly interested the French, who, as stated above, had great trouble procuring an adequate supply during the eighteenth century and cast a longing eye on Egypt. "The fabrication of gunpowder was confided to the industry of a few foreigners who settled in Egypt . . . The gunpowder manufactured at Cairo appears to be good; the materials of which it is composed are excellent in quality . . . Gunpowder is not so dear at present in Cairo as it was in France anterior to the Revolution . . . The process employed here in the manufacture of saltpetre is exactly the same as that practiced in Europe."⁵⁷ But if Egypt possessed gunpowder, when it came to cannon another situation prevailed. Cannon began to be used in Egypt following 'Alī Bey's unsuccessful siege of Jaffa. In 1776, an English artillery officer named Robinson was appointed to be a military advisor by Isma'īl, the Shaykh al-Balad.⁵⁸ In addition to the use of cannon, firearms became increasingly important to the Mamlūks in the late eighteenth century. As the Mamlūks insisted on retaining their basic identity as a cavalry force, they sought guns which were suitable for use on horseback, leaving to their servants the use of pistols which could be deadly at close range. A third category of fighter developed, servants mounted on horseback (*sarrājūn*), many of whom, as it turned out, were Christians pretending to be Muslims.⁵⁹

Egyptian dependence on the French for their weapons was both expensive and, from a military point of view, unfortunate for Egypt. French iron and steel were of low quality; their artillery continued to be made out of copper as late as 1793. The fundamental weapon of land warfare for the French continued to be the smoothbore, muzzle-loading flintlock musket. The model of 1793 had not changed in principle for one hundred years.⁶⁰

The Mamlūks, in addition to spending vast sums on the upkeep of their military establishments, and in engaging one another in small wars, were attracted to luxury goods on a scale which none of the other military corps had ever before indulged in. A study of the residential patterns of the Mamlūk aristocracy showed that the ruling elite left the austere Citadel, where they had lived in the seventeenth century, and in the eighteenth century built villas in the fashionable suburbs, where they lived a life replete with luxury.⁶¹ One figure, Muḥammad Bey Abū Dhahab, more than any other came to symbolize the new way of life. He demanded of the French merchants on one occasion that they construct for him at their expense a four-wheeled gold carriage at an estimated cost of 7,200 French livres before shipping. Such was the profitability of the French position in Egypt that they proceeded to have the carriage made.⁶² While Muḥammad Bey Abū Dhahab was a flagrant example, all French sources testify to the degree to which the *beys*, as well as the Egyptian middle classes, sought to acquire French cloth and luxury goods. These included silk scarves, muslin shirts, ivory-incrusted weapons, or weapons with coral inlay which the *beys* would pay for in pure gold. When the Napoleonic army captured some of these, there were several fights between the savants and various soldiers over whom this booty should belong to. French soldiers at the Battle of the

Pyramids pillaged the bodies of the dead Mamlûks, searching for sequins, the gold coins first struck in Venice. Berthier, a chemist, offered 10,000 francs for the blade of a sword made of black damascus and encrusted with pure gold. The sword of Murâd Bey, which was much fought over, finally wound up in the Musée aux Invalides in Paris, as did other works of the famous craftsman As'adallah, the armorer.⁶³ The Mamlûks inherited aspects of the life style of the medieval knight. They had a similar idea of the well-rounded, versatile figure, skilled in war, in games of athletic skill, and in such pastimes as chess. They had an appreciation of luxury goods for which they paid dearly, as they did for their way of life as a whole,⁶⁴ but they sought to combine it with residence in a bourgeois suburb.

The breakdown of the Mamlûks' tributary system cannot be discussed properly apart from a discussion of ground rent, a theme no one has pursued yet. A few of the features to be discussed affecting the Mamlûks may be summarized as follows: The mounting costs of war placed severe strains on the Mamlûk households, which had to find new sources of revenue to meet them. While their involvement in commerce helped, it did not always suffice. At the same time, the new technology of war required a whole new set of personnel to employ this technology. The introduction of technology and personnel was not only a severe financial strain, but it also slowly undermined the primary rationale of the Mamlûk household, that is, as a basic fighting unit. The growing use of technicians and mercenaries, while rational from a military point of view, in the end called into question the basic legitimacy of the Mamlûk household as a pattern of organization.⁶⁵

The Ruling Class:

Part Two—The Rich Merchants, 1760–1798

A number of merchants can also be identified as members of the ruling class. They belong through ties of marriage and through wealth. According to André Raymond's analysis, the commercial elite of Cairo grew smaller in the late eighteenth century and was increasingly composed of members of the European-linked minority groups. Naturally there was an internal solidarity of the merchants which distinguished them from the Mamlûks and which occasioned interelite conflict. But before the end of the eighteenth century, ways of solving these problems were developed. The Shâh Bandar of the merchants, who was usually the wealthiest merchant, had links to the ruling *beys*, sometimes through marriage but always through trade and property.⁶⁶ The liquidity problems of the *beys* could for the most part be met by loans from the Jewish merchants, whose international contacts gave them liquid assets, and so it was not until after their decline, and after the gold shortage resulting from the decline of the Sudanese trade in the 1790's, that Mamlûk extortions from indigenous merchants, probably not elite merchants, became a regular event.⁶⁷

Raymond finds a number of defects in the organization of the merchant

community which he terms weakness of capital as opposed to liquid assets, reliance on word of mouth as opposed to written records, and reluctance to invest overseas.⁶⁸ These weaknesses were compounded by the tendency of the rich merchant to invest in land and not in workshops. If, however, one considers the rising value of land and the declining return on workshops due to the noncompetitive position of the Egyptian artisan, these trends bespeak a high degree of capitalist acumen.⁶⁹

The structure of commerce, however parochial, must have contained an element of flexibility not always found in Europe or in other parts of the Arab world. Raymond mentions that, although Turks of the Hijaz region would not accept paper money from the French as late as 1730, this was not the case in Cairo and the Mediterranean countries. There was also the institution of the upper-class *dallala*⁷⁰ as a seller of merchandise. The *dallala* was a crucial part of the development of the world market which could only be played by women, for the *dallala* had to persuade the upper-class women to make fundamental alterations in their consumption patterns. They were successful in introducing French luxury products.

Still other evidence drawn from the lives of these persons indicates the changing role of the rich merchants in Egyptian history. They had, of course, a large number of personal attendants; but, especially in the first half of the eighteenth century, they exhibited a considerable trend toward buying and freeing slaves.⁷¹ They aided in the construction of mosques and *zāwiyas* (monasteries). These were used for *ḥadīth* studies, which, as we will show in the second chapter, served as ideological supports for the merchants' activities.⁷² Finally, the changing legal context of property in land was itself transformative.

The eighteenth century witnessed an increasing breakdown in the Ottoman land system which permitted all segments of the local ruling class to gain control of part of this important source of wealth. The breakdown of the *iltizām* system was officially recognized in 1728/1141 by the Ottoman financial bureaucracy in Egypt, the Ruznamjā. It had had a short and unsuccessful history, beginning in 1658/1069, when it was established as an alternative to a system based on government tax collectors. The *iltizām* system divided the land into tax farms to be awarded by the government or sold to the highest bidder. The government was to retain ownership, and all rights would revert to it upon the death of the *multazim* (tax farmer). The *iltizām* system depended for its successful implementation on the existence of a strong central government. With the weakening of the central government which took place during the eighteenth century, there was a rising trend toward the alienation of *iltizāms* which came to be known as *asqāt al-iltizāmāt* or *asqāt al-qurā*. The land was alienated to individuals and did not revert to the government. The Ottoman financial administration, as has been mentioned above, began to try to deal with the problem of the loss of revenues in 1728. From this year onward the government maintained records called *Sıvıllat asqāt al-qurā*. The weakness of the central government was a great advantage to the capitalist class, and there is substan-

tial evidence that Mamlūk *beys*, perhaps in debt to merchants or in need of money, illegally alienated their *iltizāms* to merchants.⁷³ Thus a number of Egyptian merchants and even '*ulamā*' acquired property in land which, given the weakness of the central government, they were able to transmit directly to their heirs by paying a fee called *badal al-muṣallaḥa*, creating an inherited tax farm; or, even more illegally, they could transmit it disguised as *waqf*. Trade revived, but as it did so, political and social conditions in Cairo deteriorated. Investment in urban real estate was risky, and investment in land was more secure.⁷⁴ To acquire land required some money. To make investment in land, for example, irrigation repairs, however, required very large capital investment. This was attempted by several *beys*, but it was an effort generally beyond the reach of the rest of the class.

The Egyptian Lower Middle Classes, 1760–1798

The indigenous Egyptian lower middle classes—local merchants, '*ulamā*', and artisanal elite—have not been heretofore discussed. They fall in Raymond's category of being worth above 5,000 but less than 50,000 paras. Through ownership, through possession of special skills, or through patronage they retained a solidarity with the ruling class which was absent among the wage-labor segment of the guilds of unskilled workers. This class emerged with and gained coherence from the coming of the French. After several decades of relative depression, it was again severely weakened by Muḥammad 'Alī.

In the eighteenth century, this class was both a customer and a retailer of French merchandise, and procured goods needed by the French. Like the French, it was put at a disadvantage by the monopoly system of the *beys*, as well as by their policy of extortions and forced loans, and therein lay the rationale for the Napoleonic attempt at an alliance. Cairo merchants traded many products, some locally made, some procured with great effort from Africa, such as henna, or from Asia, such as spices.

The '*ulamā*', as did the merchants, benefited from this commercial revival. Some were merchants themselves or engaged in trades.⁷⁵ Others, many of whom were *shaykhs* in al-Azhar, were *nuzzār*, or superintendents of *awqāf*. These *nuzzār* became important officials due to their control of liquid assets and credit. It seems clear that the '*ulamā*' were unsalaried and thus dependent on largesse. Apart from wealth they might have inherited, support from their relatives, and so on, the '*ulamā*' made money from giving private lessons and copying manuscripts. Prior to the age of Muḥammad 'Alī, it is claimed, a *shaykh* could live in luxury if he had only two students from the family of a moderately wealthy *fallāḥ*. These students would be expected to be his servants and provide him with free merchandise; one *shaykh* even had his home constructed through volunteer labor.⁷⁶

Shaykh 'Abdullah al-Sharqāwī, who died occupying the position of Shaykh al-Azhar in 1818, was a prominent member of this group. He was

poor during his youth and depended on charity from the Syrian merchant community. After a psychological breakdown, he emerged as a powerful *Ṣūfī* leader of the Khalwatiya. Supporters gave him a house. When he became Shaykh al-Azhar, he automatically became the *nāẓir* of the very extensive *awqāf* of al-Azhar and grew increasingly rich. He had connections with the Mamlūks, who gave him some land in Sharqiya province, which he augmented during the French occupation when the land of the émigrés was being registered. Another 'ālim, or elite cleric, who rose to a position of great wealth and power through connections with the Mamlūks was Muḥammad al-Mahdī. Originally a Copt, he gained a position in the mint and slaughterhouse (and probably some degree of control over these tax farms). Later, because of his patronage from the *beys*, he won vacant *iltizāmāt* without paying the inheritance tax. He then turned to the raising of flax, cotton, and rice. When the French came, he further enriched himself, as did many of the well-off 'ulamā', through tax-collecting activities and through participation in the Diwān.

More important for our study are the *shaykhs* whose wealth came from affiliation with the major *Ṣūfī* orders of the upper classes. These *shaykhs* tended to play an important role in the cultural revival of the eighteenth century. We therefore turn to the information available on the most important of these, Shaykh Sijāda Wafā'iya.⁷⁷ Shaykh Abū Anwār al-Sādāt, the great *shaykh* of the Wafā'iya, received his *siyāda* from his maternal cousin, and wealth came to him with the title. His own father had been a tradesman. Upon becoming the *shaykh* of the order, he became *nāẓir* of several important *awqāf*, as well as *multazim* in the Ṣa'id and in Qalyūbiya. He acquired property in Cairo, as well as fruit gardens. During the Ottoman invasion of 1786, he protected the wives and property of a number of Mamlūks, for which he was rewarded with the charge of several major mosques in Cairo (that is, he became their *nāẓir*), including Sayyidnā al-Ḥusayn, Sayyida Nafisa, and Sayyida Zaynab. He also took control of several shrines, including the Imām al-Shāfi'i. He lived on into the Muḥammad 'Alī period and ended his life as Naqīb al-Ashraf. The Wafā'iya included a number of merchants among their ranks; some of these merchants were 'ulamā' as well, such as 'Abd al-Raḥman al-Ṣafāqsi, who was a leading Maghribī merchant in Cairo, Shaykh of the Riwāq of the Maghāriba in al-Azhar, and closely associated with Muḥammad Abī Anwār.⁷⁸

Ṣūfī orders provided the chief network of horizontal communication among the various trading communities of Cairo. Otherwise, these communities were by and large self-enclosed and ethnically based, maintaining closer contact with the remote homeland whose goods these traded in than with the other Cairene groups. Such a community was the Maghribī merchant community. These North Africans had lived in Cairo a long time but were regarded ambivalently by the Cairenes as neither strangers nor one with them. Ultimately, the Maghribī community merged with the rest of Cairene society, but this was not until the nineteenth century. In the eigh-

teenth century they were a distinct community and a force to be reckoned with because of their wealth and connections. A contemporary source offers some idea of their wealth, putting the value of their trade at 100,000 pounds annually.⁷⁹ If one takes the altercations between the Maghribi artisans, merchants, and students with the Cairenes as a rough index of the relative power of the former group, then the most violent period was around 1777. The students of the *riwāq*, defended by the Maghribi merchants, became "famous" for their unruliness.⁸⁰ Thereafter the Maghāriba are referred to as consisting of a troublesome lower-class element which was frequently used as mercenary soldiers and a small, wealthy commercial elite which lasted into the Muḥammad 'Alī period.⁸¹

The upper strata of the artisans were craftsmen. They numbered some five thousand out of a total of fifteen thousand workers at the end of the eighteenth century.⁸² Concentrated in certain crafts, such as sugar refining, brass, and woodworking, they constituted in the eighteenth century the poorest and most politically conscious segment of the middle class. As the eighteenth century progressed, these two traits were intensified.⁸³ There was little upward mobility in this segment of the class, especially in the later eighteenth century, although there is considerable evidence of downward mobility.⁸⁴ Many artisans not only produced but also hawked their own wares. In the latter part of the century, production was hampered by the uncertainties of the retail market, due to conditions in the city (see below). It was likewise concentrated in families and passed from father to son.

It is difficult to determine to what extent this segment suffered from the general collapse of the framework of guild life which affected the unskilled and less remunerative crafts and presaged the growth of free wage labor.

An important consequence of the fact that the Mamluks and wealthy merchants were investing in land was that the city of Cairo became less important to them economically and was permitted to deteriorate.⁸⁵ This happened despite the fact that the majority of the middle-class merchants and *shaykhs* depended on the city as much as ever. The concerns of important merchants were frequently totally bound up with their quarter. For example, the cloth merchants of al-Ghūrīya promised Napoleon after the first Cairo revolt that they would seize the dissident elements of *their quarter*. The Shaykh al-Hāra was frequently the *shaykh* of the dominant trade guild located in the quarter (hāra). He had administrative powers, but they were purely local ones. With the decline in the power of the central administration during the later eighteenth century, and the shift of wealth to suburbs, garbage was dumped in the streets or in the Nile, and the city deteriorated physically, despite the presence of the middle and even some upper classes. In a number of instances the central authority came into collision with the still-powerful merchant community, as, for example, over the question of night lighting outside the shops. When the *muhtasib* (market inspector) tried to enforce it, the merchants made him back down.⁸⁶

At the lower level of the work force, the eighteenth century witnessed a marked growth in the service sector, which consisted of persons who worked for daily wages, and a general failure to incorporate this growing population meaningfully into guild or *ṭarīqa*. While the factors which conditioned the rise of the service sector have already been anticipated in the discussion of the enlarged middle class and their needs, it is necessary to stress the long-term internal breakdown of the corporate structure in Ottoman Cairo. Throughout the Ottoman period, there was a decline in the absolute number of guilds. There was also far less internal hierarchization within the Cairo guilds than that which existed in Damascus.⁸⁷ At the lowest level, there were guilds whose membership ranged into the thousands. They were frequently obliged to perform free labor for the government. Some, such as the "ambulatory or semi-licit trades" were only halfheartedly incorporated. At best, the *shaykh* of these service guilds could not protect his followers from market conditions.⁸⁸

The history of the urban lower classes in Cairo reflects the relative stability of the urban economy in the middle of the eighteenth century during the rule of 'Alī Bey, followed by the breakdown of urban life which characterized the period toward the end of the eighteenth century. A recent source described the period from 1735 to 1770 as one of relative economic stability and sufficiency of food. After 1770, the author found a re-emergence of economic problems and episodes of anarchy. During the period prior to the French invasion, there was extreme inflation,⁸⁹ which appears to have been caused by the vast sums of money spent by the middle classes on luxury goods.

The lower classes lived in certain very crowded quarters, such as Ḥusayniya, in which the economy was closely linked to the production of primary food products. Ḥusayniya was thus particularly susceptible to economic fluctuations such as occurred frequently in the latter part of the century when the *beys* would stockpile food outside Cairo and wait for its price to rise. The leadership of the Ḥusayniya quarter seems to have been provided by the butchers' guild and the Bayyūmiya Ṣūfī order. Butchers were described as being physically strong, of strong personality, and highly organized.⁹⁰

There were other areas of lower-class concentration around Ibn Ṭulūn mosque and Sulṭān Ḥasan mosque. The Ibn Ṭulūn area was known for its concentration of poor Maghāriba. The area was extremely volatile and probably well armed, as many of the Maghāriba served from time to time as mercenaries. The adjacent quarter of Khalīfa, which dealt in grain, was equally poverty stricken. Its leader at the end of the eighteenth century was Hajjāj al-Khudārī, the chief of the vegetable merchants' guild. He led his men in combat in 1805 and helped to put Muḥammad 'Alī in power. Khalīfa, like Husayniya, was an intensely active Ṣūfī center. It contained the

maqām of Sīdī Aḥmad al-Rifāʿī, which was noted for its tumultuous *mawliids*.

Raymond found that a certain political consciousness emerged among the lower classes during the last third of the century, through an awareness of the significance of the events of 1786. Where it was able, the middle class attempted to seize the leadership of this movement for its own ends.⁹¹ In March 1796/1200, a revolt against the extortions of Murād and Ibrāhīm led to a confrontation between a Murādī *bey* and Aḥmad Sālīm, which was resolved only through the intervention of Shaykh Aḥmad al-Dardīr. In July 1786, there was a protest in the Azbakīya quarter following the maltreatment of a gardener by a *bey*. In October 1787, the professional corporations protested against a new law of Ismaʿīl Bey. In 1788, the inhabitants of Bāb al-Shaʿrīya made a demonstration in protest against the summary execution of one of their own. In October 1790, a successful revolt in Ḥusayniya led by Aḥmad Sālīm al-Jazzār forced the *beys* to negotiate. In 1798, the arrival of the French transformed these struggles into patriotic struggles led by the middle class. Throughout the 1790's and the Napoleonic period, there had been a "decline of public order."⁹² By 1798, Cairo was unsafe for the upper and middle classes at night. When Napoleon landed, bands from the lower-class citizenry forced into existence protection societies to carry lanterns and protect wayfarers.

The causes of lower-class agitation are not difficult to determine, and some have previously been mentioned. Inflation disrupted the economic existence of the lower classes, who were located mainly in fixed-income occupations, for example, the guilds and services. At the same time, inflation helped the merchants and *ʿulamā*, who were receivers of merchandise and were paid wages in cash. At the end of the eighteenth century, there was an estimated total of fifteen thousand daily laborers, according to French sources, who had no source of income other than wages from daily labor.⁹³ Examining more specifically the situation of those groups who were alleged to have been involved in revolts, such as the Bayyūmī Ṣūfīs, we find that they were, even in comparison with their contemporaries, superexploited. Many of their members belonged to the guilds of water carriers. In times of shortage, these guilds were exploited by the authorities in the name of *ḥisba*. The guild was obliged to assist officials of *ḥisba* with the problems caused by incendiaries; the water carriers' drivers could be requisitioned by the Wālī during a time of crisis with no compensation. They were held responsible for bringing water of good quality which, considering the pollution of the Nile in the late eighteenth century, was an increasingly difficult task. The aquaduct which brought water from the Nile through Old Cairo to the Citadel was in disrepair from 1788 to 1808. This greatly increased the amount of work which the water carriers had to perform.

In general, the growth of a middle class involved in commerce greatly increased the needs for skilled and unskilled service industries. The weakness of the Ottoman central government in the late eighteenth century did not

permit its effective intervention in a regulatory capacity, hence the development of private protection societies, the use of Maghribī mercenaries.

The Egyptian Delta in the Later Eighteenth Century

From the middle of the eighteenth century to the year 1811, Upper Egypt, the Ṣa'īd, was not under the control of the central government. It was the Delta which was important, which interested the Europeans who were looking for grain. The high price of grain on the world market made the value of land rise, and with a weak central administration and many a co-operative *nāzir*, *waqf* land became increasingly identical with private property. Moneylenders entered the Delta in the eighteenth century to lend money to the *fallāḥīn* at high rates of interest, which added to the problems which the *iltizām* system created for them.⁹⁴ Moneylenders regularly received 10 percent, and it is clear from one contemporary source that they sometimes took more. Moneylending continued into the nineteenth century, despite opposition from the Mamlūks and even from the Europeans.

Moneylenders had a special entrée in the cultivation of rice and other luxury export products which required a capital outlay. Damietta never exported less than 22,000 ardebs of rice in the 1790's and sometimes twice that. Her chief customers were the Greek Archipelago and Turkey. Indeed, there was no alternative source of credit for the *fallāḥ*. The Cairene could invest in land but not directly in agriculture. For example, the Bedouin made the trade routes insecure, political conditions were unstable, and so forth. When Napoleon came to Egypt, he could not eliminate the moneylenders, but he put the Damietta rice fields under a system of direct land administration. In Damietta, the French government made the investment, advanced the capital for seed, and secured the equipment. Napoleon administered the rest of Egypt through the "village chief system."⁹⁵

To conclude this discussion of the social structure of the Delta during the late eighteenth century, it seems safe to state that, while the majority of the inhabitants were *fallāḥīn* rooted in the subsistence economy, the possibility of being uprooted from it existed as never before. One such case was that of al-Ḥājj Ṣāliḥ al-Fallāḥ, a poor merchant from al-Minūfiya who progressed from selling farm produce locally to selling slaves, and finally became a Mamlūk, in spite of the fact that he was an Egyptian.⁹⁶ How many others were able to take similar advantage of conditions in the Delta? Another case which suggests a similar evolution is that of Shaykh Ḥusayn b. Ḥasan al-Kinānī al-Ḥanafī (d. 1814/1203), who came to Cairo from Rosetta and changed from the Ḥanafī to the Shāfi'ī *madhhab* in order to study with the powerful Shaykh al-Sharqāwī. When Muhammad Khūsraw Pasha, the Wālī, came to Egypt, Shaykh Ḥusayn went to him immediately and was rewarded with presents and made *nāzir* of an important *waqf*.⁹⁷ Several members of the new bureaucracy of Muhammad 'Alī bore the name of al-Rashīdī (i.e., from Rosetta); undoubtedly a study of the social background of the

members of this bureaucracy or the student missions to Europe (from among the Egyptians) would bring to light some relationship with this dynamic sector of eighteenth-century society.

If one looks at the social history of Damietta and Rosetta in the eighteenth century, one finds that what is most often commented on by Europeans is the hostility of the inhabitants to Europeans and their great reluctance to permit the export of rice to Europe.⁹⁸ The former point, that there was hostility to European involvement in marketing, seems the more valid; however, it is true that, as the Delta became more securely a part of the world market, Damietta still resisted the Europeans' establishing a consulate. Greeks and other minorities had established themselves there and the trade was, as the French viewed it, carried on by "indigenous hands."⁹⁹ The French gained decisive control of trade in 1776. Of eighty European boats which docked at Damietta in 1776, seventy-two were French. In 1778, the French established a vice-consul, M. de Kersey, in Damietta. How did the French get in? Prior to 1776, trade between Damietta and Marseilles was carried on indirectly and by subterfuge because the populace of Damietta would riot if they learned that rice was going to Marseilles.¹⁰⁰ What seems to have occurred to change the situation was that Muḥammad Bey Abū Dhahab had recently built a new chateau in Damietta. He also owned several villages in Damietta. This fact would be quite sufficient to explain the suppression of any local opposition to the French. But—who constituted the local opposition? Rosetta was a center of the Burhāmiya Ṣūfī order which was connected to the Zaghlūl mosque, but Damietta was not a major Ṣūfī center.¹⁰¹ It is also clear that the riots in Damietta were not "food riots," because only the rural upper class, and not the poor, ate rice. The most probable explanation is that there was a struggle over who would be the middle men who controlled the marketing of rice. This struggle was also a communal struggle because it pitted the officials of the absentee landlords, the local rice merchants, and the rich peasants against the Greeks, the Syrian Christians, and finally the French. Damietta and Rosetta were both centers of communal conflict. In fact, Rosetta was rocked by communal conflict well into the nineteenth century. The convent of the Franciscans in Rosetta was ripped down a number of times until it was reconstructed once and for all in 1858.¹⁰²

The impact of the beginning of private property and the commercialization of agriculture was, for the Egyptian Delta, as elsewhere, extraordinarily disruptive. The growth of a monetary economy created new possibilities of exploitation, as it created new dreams of social mobility. The commercial problems mentioned above reflect the reality that, in the eighteenth century, Europeans established a beachhead in the Egyptian Delta from which they were to steadily expand and finally control all of Egypt, economically at least, by the age of Isma'īl a century later.

The reader who has followed the argument will see that profound changes were underway in Egypt prior to the coming of Napoleon. How did the Napoleonic occupation affect these changes?

*From the Napoleonic Era to the
End of the Mamlūk Period: 1798-1815*

The period in Egyptian history of 1798-1815 could easily be passed over lightly, if what is generally well known were not such a romantic distortion. To my knowledge, none of the standard works attempts to explain the motives of the French in terms of the economic and political realities governing Napoleon's strategy. Most works treat Napoleon's arrival in Egypt and his military encounters with the Egyptians as simply the total rout inflicted by a superior civilization on an inferior one. In reality, it was a complex effort by the French commander to pit one class against another when he was not in military control. His defeat is usually attributed to the English, to his subordinates, to anything but the Egyptians. Finally, these works regard the rise of Muḥammad 'Alī, which is yet to be satisfactorily explained, as a new era. In fact, it was a continuation of the previous era. The importance of the Muḥammad 'Alī period post 1815 was not his elimination of the Mamlūks, but rather that he himself ceased to be a Mamlūk, as he had been in significant ways during his early years in power.

A standard account of the reasons for the French Directory's approval of the invasion has been presented in many books. Basically, there were three: (a) to strike a blow at Great Britain by obtaining control of the best route to India, (b) to found a flourishing colony and exploit the best resources of Egypt, and (c) to provide for the scientific exploration of ancient and modern Egypt.¹⁰³ However, perhaps standard accounts should be taken with a grain of salt. As stated above, France was decisively defeated by England in the Seven Years' War. In various engagements of this war, it was obvious that France was weakest vis-à-vis England at sea. France had strong land armies, but England had the world's most powerful navy. Given these circumstances, the policy of the Directory and Napoleon generally called, in the 1790's, for expansion into regions like Spain, where the strength of the British fleet could be neutralized. Even so, there were dangers in this, as was shown by the support given to the Spanish by the British fleet. Why did the Directory agree, and why did Napoleon want, to risk a land army in unprotected boats in an overseas invasion? Did they really expect to obtain control of the route to India when they could not control the Mediterranean? One is strongly inclined to doubt it. They must have been prepared to take the risk of losing their fleet as soon as the English located it, and it must have been obvious to them that, with the loss of their fleet, they would be able to control only one portion of that route, which the British could bypass. Another reason which was offered also arouses suspicion. It is a truism that governments are rarely frank about their motives for going to war. The reasons which they give usually reflect their need for support from different sections of their societies. The most plausible of the reasons offered was that of establishing a colony.

We turn now to a brief account of those three years. In June 1798, Napoleon landed in Egypt, captured Alexandria, and began the march up the Nile

toward Cairo. "When Murād learned of the capture of Alexandria, he went out from Cairo to meet Bonaparte. Tchesmelis seconded the advance of his commander by going down the Nile to the village of Shubrākhīt, where he installed two batteries of nine-balls, and set up fortifications so that the village was on his left and the Delta was on his right."¹⁰⁴ When Napoleon's admiral, Perrée, who was leading the advance, arrived at Shubrākhīt, he was completely surprised by the withering artillery fire. Unable to fight back, the French sailors deserted a number of their ships. Luckily for Napoleon, there happened to be some infantry contingents in the vicinity near enough to bring up; when these arrived, they captured the gun batteries, permitting Perrée to recover his fleet. In this fierce but rarely discussed battle, each side lost about three hundred men. Even the capture of Alexandria was not as easy as the more romantic French sources have pictured it. A letter from a French soldier or officer dated July 6, 1798, spoke of the Mamlūks in Alexandria as having weak artillery but deadly musketry. One can judge from another comment in the same letter that the French did not get away unscathed. The Bedouins, this writer said, returned thirty French prisoners with an offer to collaborate against the Mamlūks.¹⁰⁵

In the Battle of the Pyramids, Napoleon was much more careful and avoided the Mamlūk artillery. He concentrated his attack on the Mamlūk cavalry. In a letter to General Kléber on July 27, Napoleon estimated that a force of 3,000-4,000 Mamlūks had attacked 24,000 Frenchmen; that the French had lost 210 dead, 150 wounded; and that the Mamlūks had lost 700-800 men, many of these in swimming across the Nile. A further comment was made that many of his troops were suffering from severe diarrhea from drinking Nile water. In general, the military results of the first year did not convince the French that they were winning decisively.¹⁰⁶

In fact, Napoleon soon changed his strategy from confrontation to one of trying to buy over his opponents, and in this he was reasonably successful. The Greeks served Napoleon after the defeat of the fleet as marines, as spies, and as merchants. Napoleon sought to revive the dying trade with the Archipelago because, with the exception of the goods specifically declared contraband, Greeks could get around the British blockade.¹⁰⁷ His support of the Greeks strengthened their position in Egypt, which in the long run was important. In the short run, they accomplished many things for him. A Greek priest in Damietta bribed a troublesome Bedouin chief. Murād's Greek general defected after the defense of Imbābā and thereafter served Napoleon by trying to win away other Greeks from the Mamlūks.¹⁰⁸ Napoleon was also able to enlist Maghāriba and Turks into his service in Egypt. However, most of the Mamlūks who were prepared to follow Napoleon to France were of Christian origin: Greek, Syrian, and Coptic.¹⁰⁹ But despite his successes in weakening the Mamlūks by winning contingents away from them, Napoleon could not defeat them outright. The old Mamlūk strategy of waiting in Upper Egypt, which had worked in 1786, as well as in the past, worked again.

Of more importance to this study is Napoleon's effect on the middle

classes. From the time of his arrival in Cairo his proclaimed policy was directed toward winning their support, that is, the support of the merchants and '*ulamā*'. Once he was in Egypt, his own need for revenue came into conflict with the original idea of a broad-based trade alliance. Instead he became actively involved in the international trade of the elite. He sought to keep the Damietta trade from being impeded and tried to stop Ibrāhīm Bey's crossing the Egyptian border. He sent a messenger to Jazzār Pasha with some Syrian merchants, but this move turned out to be completely unsuccessful. When the mission failed, Jazzār Pasha killed the Syrian merchants.¹¹⁰ Circumstances also frustrated other Napoleonic overtures. The Dārfūr caravan which appeared in 1799 was plundered by French troops at the village of Banī'Adī. Thus, although Napoleon wished to expand the scope of existing trade and corresponded with the Sultan of Dārfūr for this purpose, he was unsuccessful.¹¹¹

Napoleon wanted to revive other trade routes, notably that through Suez. He began by lowering duties on the customs house at Suez and appointing a senior official, Possielgue, to be in charge of it.¹¹² But, as a recent study shows, Napoleon's policy here was perhaps too cautious. He overestimated the importance, in the Islamic world, of the Sharīf of Mecca, the Amīr Ghālib. Napoleon carried on correspondence with him for five months, from August to December 1798, before he ordered his Suez commander to try to gain as many merchants as he could from among the Hijāzīs, Yamanīs, and 'Umānīs to trade directly with Suez.¹¹³

An active trade policy went hand in hand with support for the claims of the middle classes to the land. Registration of land gave Napoleon a weapon to expropriate Mamlūks who had fled, rewarding the upper classes whose support he needed, and at the same time laying the foundations for a more secure tax base. Through the land registration decree, Napoleon acquired some two-thirds of the land for the state, with the remaining one-third presumably already in the hands of members of this class, since the prominent *beys*, who were the major *multazims*, were all at war with him. Had this land registration of August 1798 been fully implemented, it could have destroyed the Mamlūk class. However, the registration required a degree of control which the French possessed only occasionally.¹¹⁴ French military weakness, for example, led to increasing concessions to Murād Bey in the Ṣa'id, while in Cairo, ironically, the French ransomed his wife, Sayyida Nafīsa, for 120,000 talaris. But even in Cairo, the French could not always get their way. Ibrāhīm Efendī, a clerk in the financial administration upon whom the French depended to understand the *iltizām* system, refused to divulge the names of the remaining Mamlūks or to explain the Qirma notational system to them. When he was implicated in a treasonable act of supplying arms to and sheltering Mamlūks, the French nevertheless found it prudent not to execute him.¹¹⁵

Why, then, did the middle classes of Cairo turn against the French and provide support and leadership for the uprisings of Cairo which shattered the occupation? This question can be answered in many different ways. The

behavior of the French soldiers, the many affronts to Islamic traditions such as occurred during Ramaḍān, the hardships suffered by the Cairenes from extortions, fighting, and so on can be adduced. A recent writer found that there was a close relationship between the uprisings of October 21-22, 1798, and the imposition of a graduated tax on urban property. This tax would have hit at the core of middle-class investments, especially those of the poorer merchants who were essentially shopowners, and would give them a strong motive to support the opposition to the French.¹¹⁶

In addition to the taxation of urban properties, the middle classes were adversely affected by the general stagnation of trade, both Middle Eastern and European. This was a consequence of the invasion and blockade. By 1805, direct trade with Marseilles was at a standstill,¹¹⁷ meaning the long-distance trade was indirect and the Greeks were gaining a stranglehold.

The return of the Ottomans spelled further difficulties for the Egyptians. The Ottoman army was able to briefly impose a settlement on the *beys* but was unable to maintain it after a withdrawal of their forces. In July 1803, the Mamlūks accepted a treaty with 'Alī Pasha Burghul, Wālī of Egypt, which permitted them to stay in Egypt on a fixed income but subjected them to paying an increased *mīrī*, or state land, tax. They also lost various subsidiary revenues which they had usurped from the Ottomans in the eighteenth century, such as the ports and customs revenues.¹¹⁸ But when Yūsuf Pasha, *wazīr* (plenipotentiary) of the Turkish forces in Egypt, tried shortly before this to collect back taxes for the period from 1798 to 1801 from the *mul-tazims*, they refused. The *wazīr* then sent Coptic tax collectors directly to the villages, but the *multazims* demonstrated and forced Yūsuf Pasha to back down.¹¹⁹

As was mentioned above, the elimination of the Mamlūk system by Muḥammad 'Alī came during the Wahhābī war. Muḥammad 'Alī's campaigns led to the formation of a new military structure. He had begun in the tradition of his predecessors: in order to pay his soldiers, he had extorted money from merchants and even whole towns; he had expropriated cattle and crops as needed. With the death of Alī Bey in 1807 and the defeat of the British in the same year, Muḥammad 'Alī finally gained control of the Delta. Realizing that his army of ten thousand men could not be supported by the existing system of taxation, he began, first on a small scale, a series of financial reforms which were all more or less in the tradition of 'Alī Bey. During 1806-1808, he removed the tax collectors; during 1807-1809 he gained control of monies from *waqf* land and Uṣīya land. In 1810 he launched an attack on the Coptic clique in the financial administration. These moves, combined with his first high profits from trade (1810), permitted him to abolish the *iltizām* system, replacing it with a system of government officials. Trade financed the recapture of Upper Egypt, which had been outside the effective control of the central government since the time of 'Alī Bey. The traditional refuge of the *beys*, Upper Egypt was also important for the control of the African trade.

Muḥammad 'Alī's attempt to increase revenues through the control of

trade increasingly brought him into alliance with the foreign and indigenous commercial groups and one step nearer to the new system. In 1810 a French consul estimated that Muḥammad 'Alī had made more than three million francs selling wheat to the English, and this more than quadrupled in the period from 1810 to 1813 (during the peninsular campaign), until the resumption of Russian wheat exports brought an end to the boom. Throughout this period (1810–1813), Muḥammad 'Alī was deeply involved in the mechanics of trade—hiring or purchasing ships, appointing commercial agents in Malta, Portugal, and Spain. He acquired the grain monopoly for himself and drove off a number of speculators. As a consequence of these efforts, the Egyptian national income, which had been estimated at four million francs in 1798, rose in 1812 to thirty or forty million francs.¹²⁰

When war was thrust on Muḥammad 'Alī by the Porte, he entrusted the organization of the Wahhābī campaign in 1811 to the leading merchant of Cairo, who had large investments in the Meccan trade, Sayyid Muḥammad al-Mahrūkī.¹²¹ A contemporary observer writing in 1814 noted that, when Muḥammad 'Alī deposed the Sharīf of Mecca for his "Wahhābī views," it was obvious that he was trying to get at the Sharīf's alleged wealth, which was thought to have been hidden. He also thought that Muḥammad 'Alī was disposed to undertake the capture of the Wahhābī capital, an achievement which was difficult from a military point of view, because of the rumors of the wealth of Al-Dar'īya.¹²² One must conclude that the merchants felt they had a large stake in the outcome of the war and hence lent their support to Muḥammad 'Alī. The Wahhābīs certainly were known for creating havoc on the trade routes; but perhaps it went beyond this. Lane wrote that, in the theology which the Wahhābīs actively propagated, coffee (a Yamanī product) was permitted, while tobacco (a Syrian and Turkish product) was forbidden. This brand of theology boded ill for the Cairo merchant community.¹²³

By 1815, Muḥammad 'Alī once again expanded his agriculture monopolies, which he financed through state revenues; previously, production had been financed by local merchants. The expansion of the monopolies to cover the vast majority of the crops grown in the Delta occurred hand in hand with the introduction of costly and important reforms in the army which would put it on a European basis. As this occurred, and the new structures grew in strength, the remaining Mamlūks, including the European ones, faded from the scene.¹²⁴ A new era was dawning.

The Middle Classes: 1798–1815

There have been frequent references to the role of the middle classes in the Napoleonic invasion, vis-à-vis the Ottomans, and in their original support of Muḥammad 'Alī and the Wahhābī campaign. The elite commercial elements, the landowners, and many of the 'ulamā' opposed Muḥammad 'Alī and hoped for an Ottoman return. The principal trend during the period be-

tween 1798 and 1815 was that the commercial minorities and the foreign trading community grew stronger, while the majority of the indigenous middle class grew weaker. Splits appeared that had been covered up by the *ṭuruq* in the eighteenth century, which permitted one element of this class to be played against another, a tactic used by Napoleon as well as Muḥammad 'Alī.¹²⁵ By 1815, the question had clearly been resolved. A strong figure, Yūsuf Būghus, an Armenian merchant from Smyrna, had been appointed, first, chief dragoman, or interpreter, then minister of trade. Shortly thereafter, many of the remaining merchants of Cairo moved to Alexandria. On abolishing the *iltizām* system, Muḥammad 'Alī felt obliged to offer land to only a few of the former landholders. Some received pensions; a majority received only promises which amounted to nothing. He threatened the *shaykhs* with the loss of still further revenues for their "malversations" as *waqf* superintendents. In 1814, the land was examined, and if the land was declared in excess of the written amount, it was removed and given to the village, while the rest was taxed unless the owner had a special deed from the Ottoman *wazır* Yūsuf or from Sharīf Efendī. The *shaykhs* made a few halfhearted protests and retired into subdued silence.

The women of the middle classes at this point made one violent strike against Muḥammad 'Alī, and they were put down with force. For women like the wife of 'Abdullah al-Sharqāwī, who ran her husband's financial affairs and made a fortune in the process, and others who were entrepreneurs in the eighteenth century, the coming of the Muḥammad 'Alī bureaucracy was a crushing setback.¹²⁶ Finally, in 1815, some *shaykhs* warned the Kikhyā *bey* that this last tax would induce the ruin of the mosques and the collapse of Islam. The Kikhyā told them that the responsibility lay with the Pasha and his tax agents, Maḥmūd Bey and al-Mu'allim Ghālī. These latter criticized the *shaykhs* for obstructing the financing of a holy war. Another, and last, protest in June 1815 was met by the army, and the demonstrators were beaten.¹²⁷

Thus, between 1798 and 1815 the indigenous middle class was seriously weakened in power and wealth while the Levantine foreign middle class was strengthened; this was a continuation of trends which had been noticed in the 1780's and thereafter. One can conclude that the Mamlūk system broke down between 1798 and 1815, not for want of recruits, nor even of skilled ones, but because in terms of mounting an effective army, this type of system, by its nature divided at the top, could not solve its attendant financial problems. Basically, the Mamlūk system broke down because the pressure of Western trade and technology was relentless and in the end too strong to be resisted. It had to be effectively incorporated. Muḥammad 'Alī, in shifting to the use of Western advisers, was acknowledging the new realities of power and was conducting a self-conscious policy which balanced the factors favoring greater independence against those militating in favor of dependence. In the Delta, the lower classes were suffering from the breakdown of the subsistence economy. Increased demands were placed on them for production, and a cash economy placed most of them in a situation in

which they were probably worse off than they had been before the middle of the eighteenth century. The same was true of the urban poor, who lived in an increasingly deteriorating physical environment during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries in Cairo and who entered in increasing numbers the ranks of the conscript army, a sign that no better occupation was open to them.

These, then, were the main trends of the social and economic history of Egypt from 1760 to 1815. These trends had their beginnings around the middle of the eighteenth century and progressed relentlessly through the last few decades of the eighteenth century into the nineteenth century. In retrospect, the Napoleonic interlude was far less significant for Egypt than the lopsided capitalist development of France in the eighteenth century.

The period of sixty-five years between 1760 and 1815 represents a unit as well as a part of a larger whole in Egyptian history. These sixty-five years saw the gradual breakdown of the Ottoman system. With the internationalization of the commercial sector and the rising importance of the agricultural exports, the composition of the ruling class changed. A rebirth of politics took place, as Mamluks and others struggled to secure the new sources of wealth; old solidarities based on corporate structures began to break down and were replaced by new ones more characteristic of an urban class structure. This process of transformation lasted until around 1860, for one hundred crucial years in which the basic framework of modern Egypt was created.

Chapter 2

The Religious Framework of The Eighteenth-Century Revival

A great religious revival accompanied the commercial revival which affected not only the Mamlūks and the middle classes but the artisan community as well. This revival took the form of a renewed involvement in Ṭariqa Ṣūfism. Old, established orders experienced a sudden burst of energy, grew in membership, and played important roles in cultural and social life. New ones emerged, especially among the lower classes. The approach of this chapter is to study the Ṣūfī revival as both a socioeconomic and a religious-cultural phenomenon. As a socioeconomic phenomenon, the *ṭariqa* constituted during the period of the revival the modal social institution for the middle and upper classes during the transition from a society based on medieval corporate institutions to one based on a modern class structure. By "modal" it is meant that a study of the range of the existing *ṭuruq* will find that their structures closely approximated existing social and economic realities, and that their milieu was the most active focus of social and cultural life in the society. For the lower classes, the popular *ṭuruq* were an additional shield at a time when the guild structure was being eroded. For both the upper and lower classes, the high point of *ṭariqa* activity as measured in terms of outstanding leaders and important writing was the period between approximately 1760 and 1790. After this date, the growing gap between wealthy and poor broke down the solidarity within the *ṭuruq*. The celebrated case of 'Abdullah al-Sharqāwī is presented in some detail as an example of this process.

Until the beginning of the eighteenth century, Egypt was a medieval society dominated by a set of institutions each of which was self-contained and characterized by a vertical structure. The head of a guild or the *muftī* of a rite presided over a hierarchy through which he mediated between the members of his corporation, on the one hand, and the rest of society, on the other. The latter phase of the commercial revival broke down the authority of these corporate structures without, of course, destroying them or replacing them in any sense.¹ Al-Azhar and the guilds continued to exist, but there was a general felt need to participate in social groups which more nearly reflected the changed social situation, a situation in which artisans of a given trade, merchants in a particular community or of a particular ethnicity, or Mamlūk warriors of a given house could no longer always identify with "their own" group. The emergence of urban class structure, which gave wealth or the promise of wealth to some while withholding it from

others on a new basis, needed legitimation. This fact played a large role in the revival of *Ṭarīqa Sūfism*. The new economic differentiation expressed itself during this period for the first time in the creation of suburbs where wealth, not occupation or origin, was the sole criterion for admission. The internal structure of the *Sūfi ṭuruq* mirrors this transition. I make this claim on the basis of the information which the historical sources contain about the lives of particular *Sūfis* in this period, taking this as the primary data, rather than the somewhat idealized schematizations which are to be found in the manuals for their followers, the *murīdīn*, in the nineteenth century. These later works, which are often quoted by scholars, impose a picture of the organic unfolding of the *ṭuruq*, of an internal logic of organization which was apparently based on simple symmetrical patterns. The latter writings actually reflect the more static institutional conditions of the nineteenth century.

Concentrating on the contemporary historical evidence, one finds that in the "elite orders" a group of wealthy figures surrounded a *shaykh*, who was also usually quite wealthy. A few "pure intellectuals" with compatible views may have received patronage. These "prominent" members of the *ṭarīqa* included a mixture of Mamlūks, rich merchants, 'ulamā', Ottoman bureaucrats, and others. Sometimes these members appeared to offer a sort of collective leadership of the organization, to judge from specific events and literary evidence. Sometimes they submerged their personalities into an organization under the guidance of the *shaykh* in the sense in which the *murshid-murīd* relationship between members and initiates have traditionally been understood. This tension between the vertical and the horizontal increased as a class structure imposed greater and greater strains on the functioning of the *ṭarīqa*. By the end of the eighteenth century, strains in certain elite *ṭuruq* were easily discernible. While a *shaykh* would not leave al-Azhar, nor would he leave a *ṭarīqa*, his behavior vis-à-vis these institutions would change as he forged a set of social bonds along class lines. The popular orders from the middle of the eighteenth century appear to follow the opposite path. The role of the *shaykh* was initially much more important. He was sometimes credited with supernatural powers and sometimes permitted a role as a political leader. By 1798, the role of these *shaykhs* was more limited.

In what sense can we speak of the *ṭarīqa* as a socioeconomic unit? One must readily admit that hard evidence is difficult to find: there are no membership lists, and it is difficult to ascertain the relative sizes of different *ṭuruq*. Moreover, since there is little hope of finding such records, the best that can be hoped for is more information from wills and property records on the nature and size of a *ṭarīqa's* wealth.

This problem can nevertheless be surmounted. If one takes the prominent figures about whom information is already accessible as a definable collectivity, one may discuss the *ṭarīqa* as a group whose identity, behavior, and degree of solidarity is that of a given historical epoch about which we also

have some knowledge. The prevailing assumption is that the popular orders were "large," with multiple memberships common. The size of the elite Šūfi orders, the Bakriya-Khalwatiya and the Sādāt al-Wafā'iya, which are identified in this study as the most important orders patronized by the upper class and the wealthy middle classes, was obviously much smaller. They were in fact continuations of indigenous salons now caught and partly transformed by the new religious fervor, that is, the older Bayt al-Šiddiq and Bayt al-Sādāt.

The specific problem of this chapter, then, is to define the relationship of the *ṭarīqa* to the social history of the period. We turn first to the *ṭuruq* of the elite. It seems that, as the corporative nature of all social institutions began to "break down" at the end of the Egyptian "middle ages," the Islamic intellectual elite reconstructed itself, using the Šūfi *ṭarīqa* as a dam against the new seductive ideology of bourgeois individualism and utilitarianism. The consequence of this for members of these two orders has already been indicated. For those in higher positions, the pull of the new economic nexus led to the acceptance of this new "ideology," which in turn undermined the earlier solidarity of the order. Where this occurred, the breakdown of religious solidarity and its replacement by more secular loyalties was nothing short of spectacular. This can be seen in al-Jabartī's account of the case of al-Sharqāwī and his followers. It can be shown that the *ṭarīqa* in general, though not fully a "class" institution, was developing consistently in that direction.

How did changes in the *ṭarīqa* affect its religious and cultural mission? The principal data on such matters can be found in the pietistic writings by Šūfis, notably in the field of *ḥadīth*. Over and above the requirements of ritual, there was an enormous revival of interest in *ḥadīth* studies by the Bakriya and the Wafā'iya and other orders. One finds in these *ḥadīth* studies and in the Šūfi manuals comments—sometimes direct, sometimes indirect—which illuminate the normative process by which Šūfis adjusted to the existing economic and social realities. Problems relating to commerce and profit were raised in numerous *ḥadīth* manuals. For example, these manuals promised that *tawakkul*, trust in God often manifested in withdrawal from earthly affairs, was not an obstacle to gainful activity. This was a revolutionary promise. Book after book contained particular points of emphasis which were not stressed in earlier or later works in *ḥadīth*. One theme which was emphasized during this period was the concern that the chain of *ḥadīth* transmitters, the *rāwīs*, be unbroken back to the beginning. There is of course nothing new in this. But the particular emphasis which it received in this period is indicative of the hold the Šūfis tried to maintain over their *ṭuruq* and vis-à-vis the growing popular orders which also found in *ḥadīth* a justification for their own beliefs. It is for this reason that *ḥadīth* studies are included here and not in a chapter devoted to cultural works. *Ḥadīth* studies were more than just by-products or reflections of the age. They were an integral part of the collective religious consciousness and

performed a role analogous to *al-dhikr* (meditation) and *al-inshād* (recitation). The writers were motivated by religious fervor; sometimes they achieved fine results in scholarship, but like the Qur'ān reciters, and the *murshidūn* (spiritual mentors) at a *dhikr*, their work should be understood as part of a larger whole. To apply "modern" methods to the study of *ḥadīth*—especially those which treat any book as "literature"—blurs the crucial distinction between law and culture. Not all works stand in the same relation to their society as others. As we shall explain, *ḥadīth* studies was an integrative force which contributed to the internal juridical development of Islamic history.

The spiritual designation of the *ṭuruq* as "orthodox" or "popular" can to some extent serve as a guide to an analysis of the *ṭuruq* as part of social history.² Although these terms do not carry any normative or social consequences a priori, they do suggest a sort of social map. Another approach which is useful to the social historian of religion is to study the mode of expression of piety, for example, activist or quietist, and whether or not this is orthodox expression. What follows is an attempt to use both these approaches.

Within the same social class, there were different spiritual orientations, and these were embodied in different *ṭuruq*. We shall study here two fundamentally opposite orientations, represented by the Bakrīya and the Wafā'iya. The first was a movement led directly by the merchants. The second was based on upper-class merchant patronage relationships. While both orders participated in the cultural renaissance and both enriched themselves immeasurably from the commercial revival, their mystical theological orientations differed. Both movements produced great works in *ḥadīth*, and *ḥadīth* served them well as a medium of debate. A pioneering study of Egyptian mystical theology has characterized the differences between them in the following ways: Among these conservative, Sharī'a-minded '*ulamā*', the soul might seek illumination through either (a) the quietist way (illuminationist, or *ishrāq*) or (b) the activist way (*jālā*'). The first was the way of the Wafā'iya, the second that of the Bakrīya.³

Sādāt al-Wafā'iya

We turn first to the Sādāt al-Wafā'iya, the order which made the most important contributions to the cultural revival of the eighteenth century. This order was a patron-client order, whose harmonious social relations with the upper classes brought at various times material rewards. It was made up of a small group of prominent intellectuals who lived from patronage which they received both in Egypt and from abroad. The peculiar characteristic of their structure, derived from the absolute spiritual reverence paid to their *shaykh*, Muḥammad Abī Anwār, was no doubt related in complex ways to this fact of patronage.⁴

The relationship between the *murīdīn* and the charismatic *shaykh* was defined unilaterally in the *takniya* ceremony in which honorific names were bestowed. Other aspects of internal organization were not rigidly maintained. The principal theme in mystical thought which the Wafā'iya stressed was the special role of Ahl al-Bayt as the figures whose lives embody the highest moral examples. This theme was linked to the assertion of the religious obligation of visiting the tombs of the *ṣaḥāba* buried in Egypt, which naturally led to an emphasis on the spiritual efficacy of the visitation of tombs. These themes, to be discussed in detail later, served not only to reinforce the image of Muḥammad Abī Anwār as the continuator of the Ḥaqīqa Muḥammadiya but also to distinguish the Wafā'iya from its rival, the Bakriya. In contrast to the focus on Ahl al-Bayt, the Bakriya, as their name implies, claimed that their spiritual genealogy extended back to the caliph of the Rāshidūn era.⁵ The visiting of the tombs of the *ṣaḥāba* is broadened in Bakriya writings to include later figures. In one sense the factor of rivalry or coexistence over a long period of time accounts for the choice of opposite motifs. But there was also a more organic basis, a basis which sustained the "quietist" orientation, a religious environment appropriate to its material and spiritual situation.

The Wafā'iya had come to Egypt from North Africa in the eighth century and had taken up residence first in Alexandria, then in Cairo.⁶ In the seventeenth century, their salon was praised by both al-Khafāji and al-Nābulusi for its poetry, when they maintained a fashionable residence in Birkat al-Fil.⁷ In the eighteenth century, the transformation of the order began with the rise of the Shaykh al-Ṭarīqa, Muḥammad Abī Anwār al-Sādāt, whose charismatic personality drew major intellectuals from the Islamic world to him, and whose name was referred to with the greatest respect by most of the poets and writers of Egypt late into the nineteenth century, long after his death and the decline of the order. His father was a merchant, but not well-off. Abū Anwār's success was apparently a consequence of his education and his family connections, in other words, the patronage which he received. He studied with his maternal uncle Shams al-dīn M. Abī al-Ashraf b. Wafā' and others in the *ṭarīqa*, as well as with his paternal uncle 'Abd al-Khāliq. By birth he was connected to the order on both his father's and his mother's sides.⁸ Not much exists in the literary sources of the period to indicate how he rose to become Shaykh al-Sijāda, the position which he "inherited" in 1772/1182 from Muḥammad Abī al-Ashraf. In 1775/1190, his relations with the Ottomans were such that he approached the Ottoman *ra'īs al-kuttāb*, 'Abd al-Rāziq Efendi, for funds for the repair of the *zāwiya* of his ancestors, and they were granted. Muḥammad Murtaḍā al-Zabidi was appointed to head the *zāwiya*. 'Abd al-Rāziq was at the time a student of al-Zabidi. The grant of funds permitted the enlargement and decoration of the Riwāq al-Kubrā, later, houses and palaces were constructed around the *zāwiya*.⁹ Abū Anwār also expanded his influence among the Mamluks in Egypt by protecting their wives during the Ottoman invasion of 1785. This

saved a number of prominent *beys* large sums in ransom, and for this he was remunerated by being appointed *nāẓir* of a number of important mosques in Cairo.¹⁰

As mentioned previously, what was distinctive about the Wafā'iya in the late eighteenth century was their concern with the theme of Ahl al-Bayt. The tradition of the Āl al-bayt (ahl al-bayt) served as a point of reference for the Wafā'iya in their mysticism and poetry, just as the Rāshidūn did for all the Bakriya.¹¹ It was said to have been derived from the principal literary source of the Wafā'iya, a book entitled *Al-Kashkūl*, by Bahā' al-dīn al-'Āmilī, who lived in the sixteenth century. It was claimed that a particular *qasīda* (classical form of Arabic poetry) in this book was the beginning of the use of the theme of Ahl al-Bayt.¹²

The Ahl al-Bayt theme was closely related to the custom of visiting the tombs of the *ṣaḥāba* who were buried in Egypt. The *ṣaḥāba* were an earthly embodiment of the Prophet's divine nature, the Ḥaḳīqa Muḥammadiya. Meditation at the tomb in time of crisis gave the most immediate spiritual contact with the Prophet, the Messenger of God. 'Abdullah al-Shubrāwī, a Wafā'i *shaykh* who died in 1758/1172, wrote about two of the *saḥāba*, Āl Ṭaha and Āl Aḥmad, al-Idkāwī, another Wafā'i *shaykh* (died 1768/1182), wrote in praise of Fāṭima al-Zuhrā, citing *ḥadīth* which were apparently from Shī'ite writings.¹³

The concept of Muḥammad Abī Anwār as the *imām*, as continuator of the Ḥaḳīqa Muḥammadiya, a concept which is drawn from *Al-Kashkūl*, was repeated in various ways. He was referred to as Ṣāhib al-zamān (Lord of His Time), al-'Urwa al-wuthqa (The Most Firm Bond), and so on. Many of the poems written in praise of Muḥammad Abī Anwār contain similar expressions.¹⁴ Isma'il al-Khashshāb, a poet and a mystic, developed the imagery further than any other writer, claiming that God had praised Sādāt in the Qur'ān, this is identical to the Shī'i claim concerning the *imāma* following Ibn Hānī al-Andalusī's praising of al-Mu'izz li-dīn allah al-Fāṭimī. By this he meant that the Qur'ān praised the Ahl al-Bayt in its descriptions of their *ṭuhr* and *barā'a* (purity and innocence). Al-Khashshāb believed in the Shī'i theory of Waṣīyallah, which he applied to Muḥammad Abī Anwār, saying that, if he had been present at the time of the Prophet, he would have gone to Heaven with al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn, the sons of Imām 'Alī.¹⁵ Al-Khashshāb further claimed that al-Sādāt knew the *ghayb*. Other poets pursued similar themes of praise. The Shaykh Riwāq al-Maghāriba, 'Abd al-Raḥman al-Ṣafāqsi, wrote in a poem that he was al-Mahdī al-Muntazar (the awaited *imām*). Muḥammad ibn Shabānat (Shubāna) claimed that Sādāt's lineage stretched back to the Imām 'Alī, and cited *ḥadīth* for this. Yet another writer claimed that a visit to Sādāt was more obligatory than the Pilgrimage itself. Still another described him as the faithful guardian of the secret of the Messenger of God.¹⁶

The theme of the *imāma*, as the continuation of the Ḥaḳīqa Muḥammadiya, combined with the emphasis on the Ahl al-Bayt, led naturally to another important doctrinal point - the obligation to perform *ziyārat*, or

visitations to the tombs of the saints, especially those of the *ṣaḥāba* buried in Egypt. An extensive medieval literature existed on the subject of *ziyārāt*. Conservative Muslims, among whom were doubtless many Sunnis who were free of any "superstitious" beliefs, approved of such practices because of the inner religious strengthening (*tabarruk*)¹⁷ which they encouraged. In Egypt, *ziyārāt* served as a principal focus of spiritual and intellectual activity during the eighteenth century. Writings on *ziyārāt* gathered together information concerning the special virtues or the miracles attributed to the visiting of certain tombs. Such studies were carried on in Egypt within the context of renewed interest in the study of *ḥadīth*.¹⁸ The most influential Egyptian who wrote on *ziyārāt* was Shaykh Muḥammad al-Ṣabbān. Muḥammad al-Ṣabbān was honored by the Wafā'iya in the *takniya* ceremony, by which he became known as Abū'l-'Irfān, possessor of the mystical knowledge. On al-Ṣabbān's death in 1790/1205, the al-Sadāt family honored him and recalled his praise of them in one of his books, where he spoke of the honor of being initiated into the way of the Wafā'iya. "I learned," he said, "to take as an example the way of our master, the Wafā', for whom God has willed that they drink peace in their cups. The continuator of their line, a beacon light to the great and small, is Muḥammad al-Sadāt, may God protect him and us all by virtue of his ancestor the Prophet."¹⁹

Al-Ṣabbān's formal education was extensive within the conventions of the times. He concentrated on *ḥadīth* studies and read the basic texts from a number of different teachers. He also excelled in language sciences, which for him was closely related to his *ḥadīth* studies. A third area in which he studied was science (*al-hay'a* and *al-miqāt*, astronomy with geometry and science of time measurement), with Ḥasan al-Jabartī. The texts he read were the well-known works of the later Middle Ages, which included material from *al-ḥikma* (gnosis).²⁰ One of al-Ṣabbān's major books linked the theme of *ziyārāt* with that of the special virtues of Ahl al-Bayt.²¹

I wrote the book on Sira al-Muṣṭafā and the Faḍā'il Ahl al-Bayt. . . . the third chapter deals with the group of notables of the Ahl al-Bayt who are buried in Egypt, about whom I have been inquiring. . . . [a list] But there are different points of view on the locations of their burial sites. Some rely for their evidence on eye-witnesses [*arbab al-baṣā'ir*]. Sidi 'Abd al-Wahhāb al-Sha'rānī, in a section in his text (may God permit it) devoted to visiting the tombs of the Ahl al-Bayt buried in Egypt, stated, I visited them three times a year for the sake of obtaining the mercy of the Messenger of God. But I do not see any one of my associates there. As for the claim that there is no proof for their burial in Egypt, this is indifference on their part, for indeed there is sufficient reason to hold this. So I have presented an account of these tombs, one part commenting on the Amīr al-Mu'mmin, another on his wife, Sayyida Fāṭima al-Zuhrā, and another on her son Abi Muḥammad al-Ḥasan. I enlarged on this in Chapter Two in discussing the Imām [al-Mahdi al-muntazar]. And I proceed in Chapter Three to

discuss al-Sayyid Muḥammad al-Bāqir and his son Ja'far al-Šādiq and his son Mūsā al-Kāzīm, may God be satisfied with all of them and with our Umma!²²

A student of al-Šabbān named 'Abd al-Raḥman al-Jabartī had a somewhat similar formation. In his youth he was attracted to the Šādhiliya Ṣūfī order and received from them a *shahāda*, attesting to his spiritual progress. In 1775 he decided to make a tour of Egypt to familiarize himself with the tombs and shrines of his country. In the Delta, in Rashīd, he stopped to study the "Arba'in" in *ḥadīth* with Shaykh Aḥmad 'Alī al-Khudrī, as well as other books. He also attended the Mawlid al-Badawī in Ṭanṭā. His later teachers included Ṣūfī travelers, mainly al-Zabīdī, but also 'Umar al-Qināwī al-Ḥusaynī.²³

By the late 1780's, the Wafā'iya appeared to lose some of its internal cohesion as an organization, from which its power had come. Muḥammad Abī Anwār attempted to form political alliances with certain Mamlūks and to conduct "international diplomacy" with Jazẓār Pasha. The strains imposed on the members of the *ṭarīqa* are represented by Isma'īl al-Khashshāb, the main Wafā'i poet of the post-1790 period. Al-Khashshāb, by ever magnifying the powers attributed to Muḥammad Abī Anwār, implicitly enhanced his claims to authority, at a time when his actual power was receding. This would especially seem to be the case with respect to the claim that Muḥammad Abī Anwār was "al-Mahdī al-Muntaẓar" (the awaited *imām*). The concept of the Mahdī almost necessarily implied a political role. Al-Kilānī claimed that Muḥammad Abī Anwār quietly encouraged this, and gave his support to al-Zabīdī rather than encouraging an internal strengthening of the organization through liturgical devices or otherwise. Al-Zabīdī's major function within the organization was his ability to use his great intellectual prestige to propagate the idea of the Ahl al-Bayt. The Wafā'iya, as continuators of the Ahl al-Bayt (the *ḥukamā' al-'Aluwīya*), were making in Al-Kilānī's opinion a certain claim to the right to rule. They had not done so at the beginning of the reform movement, if one were to judge from the selections in "al-Lawā'iḥ al-Anwārīya." Possibly Muḥammad Abī Anwār, like the other great Ṣūfī leaders who were his contemporaries, thought that he had an assured social basis of support within the society through his order, and that he could freely pursue the accumulation of wealth through the new economic structure. Perhaps he did not realize that this wealth could undercut his popular support.²⁴

The Khalwatiya-Bakriya

In the middle of the eighteenth century, a missionary of the Syrian branch of the Khalwatiya arrived in Egypt and "created" an orthodox Sufi *ṭarīqa* which we could term a merchant-scholar order, an order distinct from the

older Egyptian Bakrīya which continued as an aristocratic salon.²⁵ The reform doctrine of the new Bakrīya was in fact a conservative restatement of Sharī'a-minded Sunni orthodoxy of the older Bakrīya and of the Egyptian Khalwatiya. What was notable was the practice. Muṣṭafā al-Bakrī and his Egyptian *khulafā'* (lieutenants) concentrated on the development of *tahdhīb* (spiritual training). *Tahdhīb* was the program of discipline along which the soul progressed on the spiritual path. The elaboration of the steps of *tahdhīb* and the setting up of the appropriate organizational form for the order were among the principal activities of the early Bakrīya reformers. After Muṣṭafā al-Bakrī's death, his tomb and the "fact" of his descent from Abū Bakr took on a certain significance.

Clearly, in the middle of the eighteenth century, many Khalwatī merchants felt a heightened sense of piety and an intense yearning for moral regeneration. They participated in the *dhikr* and, unlike the Wafā'ī, submitted to individual spiritual examination as well. The best-known aspect of the *tahdhīb* was the practice of seclusion, or *khalwa* (literally, a cell). These periods of spiritual meditation constituted something of a novelty for modern Egyptian Ṣūfism. There were few well-known recluses in late-eighteenth-century Egypt. Unlike the recluses of early Islam in Egypt, the Khalwatiya of the eighteenth century sought *khalwa* according to a ritual calendar, and they did so as a group, although each member presumably went to a private cell. In certain instances, the withdrawal probably represented a moment of heightened religious consciousness and clarification, but the routinized fraternal character of the practice lends itself to other interpretations. Although the *ṭarīqa* was a collectivity and its ritual a group expression, one should note that the *khalwa* had its individualistic side. In fact, in Khalwatī devotional writings, the collectivity of the Rāshidūn, like that of the *ṣaḥāba*, was more veneer than substance. Khalwatī books were, in fact, mainly devoted to individual biographical episodes. The normative value of these episodes for the collective ideal was strongly felt and obviously implied but never spelled out. This tension in religious thought mirrored the tension in the material situation of the members. They felt themselves to be mere individuals, and as such they were powerless. They could protest the new order in an individualist manner, for example, by forbidding a Muslim to visit a Christian shrine. The Bakrīya *jihād* (holy war) was thus directed inward. It could not be organized and directed outward.

The main Khalwatī figure of the eighteenth-century revival was Shams al-dīn Muṣṭafā al-Bakrī (died 1748/1162). He had been a student of 'Abd al-Ghanī al-Nābulusī and was a disciple of 'Abd al-Laṭīf b. Ḥusām al-dīn al-Ḥalabī. Al-Bakrī had a range of influence along the trade routes through his three principal disciples. One, a Turk, founded the Kemaliya branch (Mehmet Kemaleddin Bakrī, died 1784/1199), the second, an Arab, founded the al-Sammanīya at Mecca (Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Karīm al-Sammani, died 1775/1189), the third, an Egyptian, founded the Egyptian branch sometimes called the Hifnawīya (Shams al-dīn Muhammad al-Hifnawī, died 1767/

1181).²⁶ Al-Hifnāwī's father was a tax collector for the *beys* and not wealthy. The *beys* or some wealthy individuals gave the son money with which he built a house.²⁷

According to Hans Kissling's account, al-Hifnāwī had two principal disciples, al-Kurdī and al-Dardīr. Al-Kurdī had one principal disciple, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Tijānī, the founder of the Tijāniya.²⁸ Besides these men, one must include the figure of Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Raḥman al-Azhari, an Algerian born in 1720 who spent twenty-five years in Cairo, many of them as a *murīd* of al-Hifnāwī. Later, he founded the Raḥmaniya order as a sub-branch. It spread rapidly along the North African trade routes: a *zāwiya* was opened in Tunisia in 1784/1199, and a century later it was one of the principal orders in Tunisia. But despite the tendency of new orders to break away from the parent body, the Tijāniya and the Raḥmaniya remained somewhat intertwined. However, it is the internal problems of the Khalwatiya reform movement which are of greater significance for this study, especially the conflicts within the organization which marked the final years of the eighteenth century. The organization as centered in Cairo was theoretically a pyramid. Each *khalīfa* had a *shaykh* above him and deputies beneath him, organized by region, and around each *khalīfa* in a given locale were the disciples. The Shaykh al-Ṭarīqa thus relied on his *khulafā'* and they in turn on those below them. This was how orders were transmitted, supervision maintained, and deviation prevented.²⁹ In this period, however, the structure was better characterized as rather egalitarian and, as the life of al-Sharqāwī would indicate, fissiparous.

Al-Sharqāwī was born in a village in 1737/1150. As a youth, he memorized the Qur'ān and came to al-Azhar, where he was a very successful student. He soon became a teacher in the *madrasa*, or training school, system of al-Azhar. He then became a Khalwatī and followed the path with al-Hifnāwī. Shortly thereafter, he had a mental breakdown (*ikhtilāl fi 'aqlihi*) and went to a *māristān* (hospital; actually, a Sūfi *tekke*, or monastery), where he recovered. He then went back to teaching and to Sūfism. He went to the *khalīfa* of al-Hifnāwī, al-Kurdī, and under him took the "names," symbolizing that he undertook the discipline prescribed by the Khalwatīs, as opposed to the merely credal elements indicated by his earlier *ijāza*. Al-Sharqāwī had been poor in his youth, and when he began to teach in the *madrasa*, he received presents of food and invitations from wealthy patrons to carry on his spiritual revival work. When his *murshid*, al-Kurdī, died, al-Sharqāwī succeeded him as *khalīfa* and met every night with the *murīdīn* for Qur'ān reading and for *dhikr*. By this means he gradually enriched himself and finally bought a house; his nightly visits to other people's homes (where he had received free meals) occurred only rarely. As a consequence of his having become a *khalīfa*, wealth was showered on him and he "ceased to be virtuous"; he began to concern himself with his appearance and his clothing. In 1794/1207, on the death of Shaykh al-'Arūsī, al-Sharqāwī became Shaykh al-Azhar in a victory over his rival, Mustafā al-Sawī. Mu-

ṣafā al-Ṣāwī was also a leading Khalwatī, the *khalīfa* of Aḥmad al-Dardīr. In the resolution of this conflict, al-Ṣāwī was given another position, one which was usually part of the responsibility of the Shaykh al-Azhar, namely, the teaching in the Madrasa al-Ṣalāhiya, which was located near the mosque of Imām al-Shāfi'ī. The struggle between al-Sharqāwī and al-Ṣāwī over teaching in al-Ṣalāhiya was instigated by the retainers of al-Sharqāwī, who claimed that the position of the rectorship lacked integrity without the duties of this post. From this argument, one might fairly guess that its endowments made the post a lucrative one. The struggle was resolved through the outside intervention of Shaykh Muḥammad al-Jawharī and Ayyūb Bey al-Daftardār, who found the two principals basically in agreement and inclined toward a settlement. But al-Ṣāwī was angry with al-Sharqāwī, and when al-Ṣāwī's supporters assembled for a lesson in al-Ṣalāhiya, they advised him to take his revenge. This led Shaykh al-Ṣāwī's supporters to contact Riḍwān Katkhūdā and Ibrāhīm Bey al-Kabīr, with whom he was on friendly terms. Besides, they owed him money and were further indebted to him for cures which he had worked for them. Riḍwān and al-Ṣāwī met and the outcome of their discussion was that the debt was reduced and Riḍwān Bey became actively involved in the affair. He went to see al-Sharqāwī, and after several discussions, al-Sharqāwī gave up his rights over the *madrasa* and al-Ṣāwī stayed there until his death. With the death of al-Ṣāwī, al-Sharqāwī then took back the teaching position. This happened to take place during a time in which he was somewhat unpopular. Various of the '*ulamā*' seized on this act and raised the matter with the Pasha, insinuating various falsehoods against al-Sharqāwī. This resulted in the Pasha's removing him from the rectorship. The Wālī, however, saved al-Sharqāwī by interceding on his behalf through the chief Ottoman judicial official in Egypt, the *qāḍī*. When he returned, he ejected his interim successor, Muḥammad al-Shubrāwī. This occurred in 1794/1209, during the time of Ṣāliḥ Pasha. In 1800/1215, al-Sharqāwī became rector again. In the meantime he had established a firm relationship with Napoleon.

An incident which occurred after Muḥammad 'Alī came to power is very instructive as to the nature of the Khalwatī organization and the nature of the power relationships which existed within it. This incident involved the building of the *riwāq* of the Sharqāwa, in which 'Abdullah al-Sharqāwī was actively engaged. The decision to build this *riwāq* resulted from a fight which had broken out between some of the followers of Shaykh al-Sharqāwī and some members of the *riwāq* of the Mu'ammār. A number of Sharqāwī's followers lived in this *riwāq* and worked in its warehouses. After this fight, the *naqīb* of the *riwāq* of the Mu'ammār, Shaykh Ibrāhīm al-Sijīnī, ordered that the followers of al-Sharqāwī be expelled from the *riwāq* and from the Madrasa Taybrisiya. Thus, a new *riwāq* was constructed for the followers of al-Sharqāwī. What is interesting is the way in which the costs were defrayed. Al-Sharqāwī received financial assistance from a *bey* whose wife attended his lessons. This *bey* gave him lands and a *muqatā'a* (tax area).

He was Ibrāhīm Bey (known as the Wālī); his wife was 'Adīla Hānim bint Ibrāhīm Bey. Ibrāhīm Bey, the patron, also procured building materials for the *riwāq* and took rocks and pillars of marble from the mosque of al-Mālik al-Zāhir Baybars outside al-Ḥusayniya. The *nāzir* of this mosque was none other than Shaykh Ibrāhīm al-Sijīnī. Al-Sharqāwī also bought provisions for it, and these were distributed to persons whom he chose from among his countrymen.³⁰ Al-Sharqāwī was ably assisted by loyal attendants in his every endeavor. He relied heavily on al-Sayyid Muṣṭafā al-Damanhūrī, an assistant, to carry on his correspondence with the notables and even to write *fatāwī* (legal opinions on points of *fiqh*) in his name, for he was as well an able systematic theologian (*faqh*).³¹ But al-Sharqāwī broke down the order which had fostered him. When he grew wealthy, his peers were Mamlūks and other rich merchants. They mediated each others' disputes. His money turned his *murīdīn* into a personal retinue, which in turn developed certain expectations not dissimilar to those of the Mamlūks in a household. The Ṣūfī *ṭarīqa* could not control the divisive influence of these trends. Al-Sharqāwī did not, of course, leave the *ṭarīqa*. He remained an influential teacher and writer, with all the ambiguities which this entailed.³²

In considering the consequences for the Khalwatī's *tahdhīb* of pressures from without and dissensions from within, it is worth noting a change in the technique of the *dhikr*. (There may also have been a revival of spiritual medicine in the *tekke*.) As was mentioned above, Muṣṭafā al-Bakrī had been a student of 'Abd al-Ghanī al-Nābulusī, who was a famous continuator of Ibn al-'Arabī. A number of al-Bakrī's works deal with problems in this tradition, while others were conditioned by his quarrels with the Naqshbandīs, influential elements in the major reform-minded Ṣūfī order of later Islamic history. In his most controversial work, "Al-Faṭḥ al-quḍsī," he argued against the Naqshbandīs that the spoken *dhikr* was superior to the silent one. This met with severe opposition both from within his order and from without, especially from the Ahl al-Ḥadīth, whose importance was rising in Damascus in the eighteenth century. The transfer of the Bakriya to Egypt facilitated the development of the spoken *dhikr* and also encouraged the introduction of music into the *dhikr*. When, however, a disciple of al-Ḥifnāwī visited the Yaman and attempted to introduce music and voice technique into the *dhikr*, he met with sharp opposition from other Ṣūfis.³³

We conclude this section by returning to a discussion of the social significance of the *khalwa*, which was the most notable feature of Khalwatī *tahdhīb*. It has been said that the Khalwatīya, unlike the mystics of early Islamic history, did not seek to idealize the figure of the recluse, although they did hold up as an example the saint Sīdī Muḥammad al-Khalwatī, who lived in a *khalwa* for forty years.³⁴ The practice of *khalwa*, while rooted in Islamic tradition, owed something to the peculiar circumstances of the eighteenth century. It represented, in this view, a symbolic withdrawal. Where capitalist formations were retarded, as in eastern Europe, mystical thought has long flourished. Where capitalism marched triumphantly forward, religion has emphasized the appropriate worldly orientation. Calvin's

congregation in Geneva consecrated Sunday to God, while maintaining a continuous routine of work congruent with the ever-expanding scope of opportunities which lay open to the diligent and thrifty family capitalist of the period. The *khalwa*, on the other hand, represented a withdrawal from economic life in another sense. The indigenous Egyptian Muslim middle class was blocked from the most profitable trade (i.e., trade with Europe). The *khalwa* would seem to symbolize the powerlessness of the affluent Khalwatīs, as, on the one hand, a worldly presence was not really needed and, on the other, one could not reach God except through God's grace. Moments of ecstasy, such as were experienced in the popular orders, were, for the Khalwatīs, merely moments of delusion, drug-induced flights from reality.

Reaction to and differentiation from the popular orders and their piety were as central to theology as the corresponding social differentiations created by the emergence of class. Popular orders moved quickly to enter the swelling ranks of day labor which developed in Cairo in the later eighteenth century. The growth of these "popular" orders naturally threatened to undercut the influence and authority of the 'ulamā' of al-Azhar among the masses. The existence of these large "popular" orders which engaged in social protest and propagated heterodox religious views was an ever-present threat to middle-class merchants and 'ulamā' as well as, of course, to the Mamlūk elite. The revival of the "popular" orders was one of the consequences of the breakdown of traditional corporate structures.

In the first chapter, the Bayyūmiya was briefly mentioned as a prototype of the "popular" order. I will now discuss its distinctive doctrines. Two of the most important elements of doctrine were, first, that of the *imāma* (or the *shaykh*), that is, of the *imām* as a figure who could perform miracles by virtue of his *baraka* (power); and, second, the vows of mutual assistance to fellow members in times of need. The profound contrasts in religious outlook between the Bayyūmiya, on the one hand, and the Bakriya or Wafā'iya, on the other, should explain the religious anxiety and atmosphere of strain, as well as the need for revival, felt by the conservative 'ulamā' in their *ṭuruq*.

The Bayyūmiya appears to have been one of the breakaway orders from the Khalwatīya reformers. Its founder and chief expounder of doctrine, Shaykh 'Alī al-Bayyūmī (1696-1769/1108-1183), received a scholastic education in his youth, when he shared the characteristic preoccupations of the scholastics of that period in their studies of *ḥadīth*. In fact, he taught the famous work in *ḥadīth*, "Al-Arba'in," by al-Nawawī. But he subsequently broke with this milieu and turned his attention to the lower classes. He formed his own *ṭariqa* of highwaymen and water carriers. The break with Sharī'a-mindedness in his writings parallels this break. In his work "Sharḥ asmā' al-Suhrawardī," the *murīd* is provided with a vivid description of the stages of the mystic path to their apex.³⁵ The "Sharḥ" began with a biographical note on the origins of his ideas (p. 229), which he claimed he received as the latest in a chain of Sūfī *shaykhs* stretching back in an un-

broken line to 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib through Ḥasan al-Baṣrī and then a series of Maghribī *shaykhs*. He then turned to a discussion of problems in mystical theology: There were three levels of association with the names of God. The first level (*martaba*) deals with the meaning of names as they can be comprehended by reason. The second level (which he calls *al-takhalluq*) deals with the meanings of names, their essences, and what God has created through them. The third level (*martabat al-tahaqquq*) concerns the seeking of annihilation through the name. Al-Bayyūmī stressed that there is no short cut to the established, gradual method based on discipleship of *murīd* to *shaykh*. But he held out that those who were accomplished in the names (p. 230) could read them twice and conquer an enemy; three times and settle an important matter; four times to meet a king; five times to seek wealth or to get someone out of prison (!); six times to bring those who were not present or to defend himself against being robbed, and so on. Al-Bayyūmī then mentioned a special form of supplication for help, beginning "O! Opener of the doors, O! Causer of that which is caused, O! Stirrer of the hearts and bringer of the proofs . . ." and concluding with the reading of *iḥbāb al-asma'*, a document of numbers and letters.

In another text, he claimed that the "selling of water is agreed by all schools to be forbidden."³⁶ The water carriers believed that those who could pay should pay, but that those who could not should receive water anyway. This attack on the sale of water would suggest that the practice existed. This would seem natural, given the polluted state of most of the available water in Cairo and the breakdown of the aquaduct. Some indirect evidence suggests that commerce in water existed, although whether it took place in Cairo itself is unclear. In the biography of Shaykh Muṣṭafā b. Aḥmad, known as al-Ṣāwī, al-Shāfi'ī al-Azhari (died 1802/1216), it was stated that his father was one of the leading merchants of Egypt and that when he went to Suez he was buying water.³⁷ If we imagine a situation in which a leading merchant was able to bring in and sell pure water to the classes who were capable of paying, one could also imagine the added financial strain imposed on the local guilds of water carriers, who might otherwise have expected to receive some money for the sale of the local water to these classes.

In another essay, al-Bayyūmī defended the legitimacy of the developing religious counterculture. In this work, "Risālat al-faḍl wa'l-minaḥ," he began with a defense of the *awliyā'* (saints) "who are on earth," based on *ḥadīth*.³⁸ In chapter 3 of the same work, he emphasized protecting the rights of one's brethren, an emphasis which is not apparent in the writings of the Khalwatiya or Wafā'iya.³⁹ The most important part of this essay is al-Bayyūmī's discussion of the importance of poverty. On this subject he cited the Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq (the seventh *imām* in Shī'ī theology), who stated

that he had served six hundred *shaykhs* and asked them on four matters, but none had given his heart a cure, until the Prophet of God came to him in a dream. He said, "O! Prophet of God, what is *tawḥīd*

[theology of unity]?" And the Prophet replied, "O! Ja'far, all that is said concerning this is imagination, God is different . . ." [Finally, Ja'far asked], "What is poverty?" and the Prophet of God said, "O! Ja'far, poverty is a secret among the secrets of God which he promises to those who, by serving him, make him the seal of prophecy and who are his people and remain with him, because God almighty has ordered the prophets to mix with the poor and to be with them as [a source of] patience to them in their loneliness and misery."⁴⁰

Although later Bayyūmīs of the period of the Napoleonic invasion were apparently more revolutionary than 'Alī al-Bayyūmī, their writings could not be located. The writings of 'Alī al-Bayyūmī, however, are sufficient to show the vast gulf separating the religious world of the popular orders from that of the conservative middle classes. Something of the intensity of middle-class feeling against the popular orders can be found in the writings of the Shādhilī 'Abd al-Rahman al-Jabartī. He attacked them repeatedly and called them the *ashāwīr*, referring to the banners which they carried in their processions. He also referred to them as the rabble and as the masters of the vulgar crafts (*arbāb al-mardhūla*), who claim association with the lords of the famous shrines (*awliyā'*).⁴¹ The harshness of al-Jabartī's views reflected perhaps the growth and relative importance of these classes in the late eighteenth century.

The Revival of Ḥadīth as the Primary Legal Juridical Expression in Late-Eighteenth-Century Egypt

Heretofore I have introduced *ḥadīth* studies to illustrate conflict mirrored in Ṣūfī traditions. In this section I take up the legal and philosophical consequences of the *ḥadīth* studies of this period and make some observations on the use of *ḥadīth* in this period which affirm the value of trade and the making of a just profit from trade.

By the phrase "revival of *ḥadīth*" it is not meant that al-Azhar and other centers of Islamic learning had been neglecting fundamental works in *ḥadīth*, such as the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of al-Bukhārī, but rather that in this period there occurred a burgeoning of scholarship based on *ḥadīth* sources as data. A comparison of the writings in *ḥadīth* studies in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries shows that previously *ḥadīth* studies had played a far more limited role. In the later eighteenth century, writings in the field of *ḥadīth* not only were directed to devotional or liturgical purposes, but also branched out seeking to clarify points of historical, philosophical, or literary importance. *Ḥadīth* had become the point of reference, the primary approach to truth.

Ḥadīth studies has a logic, as well as a method, which is distinct from *fiqh* (systematic theology), even where *fiqh* does not depend on *kalām*. In the eighteenth century, as *ḥadīth* studies turned to the battles of the Proph-

et and the lives of the *Ṣaḥāba*, there was a subtle shift in this logic. Whereas, previously, *ḥadīth* studies exhibited a contextual logic among Ṣūfī authors, it turned now more and more to the accumulating of discrete truths. Thus the Bakriya, in contrast to al-Nābulusī and others in the Ibn al-ʿArabī tradition, would deem as true a proposition which was supported by a majority of the relevant *ḥadīth*. Quantity mattered. In addition, the use of *taʾwīl*, or derived meaning, was restricted in favor of literal meaning. Similarly, the role of analogy was sharply curtailed. In contrast to the universalistic logic of Aristotle to which we now turn, the logic of the specialists in *ḥadīth* studies, the *muḥaddithīn*, evolved under the impact of the Western industrial revolution toward positivism, the basic epistemological outlook of capitalism.

Fiqh as it was studied in the eighteenth century in Egypt was based on *kalām*, that is, ultimately on Aristotelian logic. Aristotelian logic, unlike the logic of context and unlike positivism, is grounded in the absolute, the eternal. This was pre-eminently the logic of administration, the logic of a state. When the state was strong, *fiqh* had a systematic character and flourished; but as the central state weakened in the later eighteenth century, *fiqh* and Aristotelian logic were reduced to a more and more elementary position in the *fahrasa*, the courses taught by the *shaykh*. Aristotelian logic did not find a significant development in all places in which theology was highly developed. This leads to the surmise that the relationships created by this logic, the absolute polarities, had a varying relevance to concrete social situations. On the whole, precapitalist commercial centers with their large artisanal populations were not characterized by social relationships which could not be subsumed in this framework. Perhaps it is thus not accidental that the later Andalusian, Fatimid, and Safavi periods appropriated Aristotle in ways quite different from the writers of Baghdad in the age of translation, the era of an agrarian tributary predominance. One could contrast *falsafa*, or peripatetic philosophy, with the use of reason by Ibn Ḥazm. Aristotelian logic was at a low ebb in Egypt during the period of commercial predominance. It recovered in the early nineteenth century as the state took over the capitalist sector and subsumed it under its administration. Its recovery occurred as the actual social relationships shifted to the polarity of bureaucrat and peasant.

There is evidence among a number of *muḥaddithīn* of the eighteenth century, and progressively so as the century developed, both of a rising literary production and of a deepening critical consciousness in scholarship as well. For example, this is reflected in the analysis of *ḥadīth*. The new focus on analysis with all it implied concerning the efficacy of human involvement contrasted with Ashʿarite theology, which stressed the more nearly total determination of God's will in human affairs. It reflected the Māturīdite reformism which had arisen in Naqshbandī circles several centuries earlier among merchants threatened by the development of the world market.

Both Qur'an and *ḥadīth* look favorably on the quest for profit, on commerce, and on production for the market. Witness such sayings as "The sincere, the faithful merchant will on the Day of Judgment be among the prophets, the righteous, and the martyrs," as well as "The trustworthy merchant will be seated in the shadow of the throne of God on the Judgment Day," and "Merchants are the couriers of this world, and the faithful curators of God on earth." According to a sacred tradition (*ḥadīth qudsī*), commerce is a privileged way of earning a living: "If you make a profit in a permissible way, your action is a *jihād*, and if you use it for your family and those near to you, it will be a charitable work, and in truth a *dirham* which comes legally in commerce is worth more than ten earned in other ways."⁴²

Certain commercial practices were forbidden by the Qur'an and *ḥadīth*, but in every case there was an element of ambiguity which permitted a certain liberality in practice. Even in the celebrated case of *ribḥ* (interest), the meaning was by no means clear. The variety of points of view which were expressed, especially by the Muḥaddithīn, was quite extensive. In fact, the enlargement and explication of the concept of *ribḥ* were from the point of view of commerce undoubtedly carried out more satisfactorily in *ḥadīth* than in *fiqh*. Likewise, in matters concerning the regulation of property, the *sunna* part of *ḥadīth* was more precise than the Qur'an, where legal devices existed in *fiqh* which were useful to merchants, such as *ḥiyal* (a device for getting around the prohibition of interest),⁴³ they were vigorously rejected by the Ahl al-Ḥadīth. Al-Bukhārī and his commentators attacked Abū Ḥanīfa on the question of *ḥiyal*.

In eighteenth-century writers in *ḥadīth*, one finds strong support for trade and opposition to *ḥiyal*. Al-Zabīdī described *ḥiyal* as a way of getting what one wants secretly; and God is severe with those who resort to secrecy.⁴⁴ But in the same work, when he turns to the concept of *kasb* (gain), al-Zabīdī quotes Ibn Jānī, who stated that, while *kasb* was good, *iktisāb* [excessive profiteering] was immoral; the judgment hinges on the dialectical conception that past a certain point gain would imply the use of immoral means. In this context, al-Zabīdī himself quoted a number of *ḥadīth* which supported *kasb*.⁴⁵ Elsewhere, in his commentary on the *Iḥyā' 'ulūm al-dīn li'l Ghazzālī*, al-Zabīdī indicated his attraction to the honest merchant. In one passage he speaks of the *jihād* against evil which the merchant wages confronted by the devil in the form of his weights and measures.⁴⁶ From this one can see that al-Zabīdī exceeded al-Ghazzālī in his degree of approbation of commerce. Al-Ghazzālī had said that one's earthly livelihood is a means of attaining bliss in the hereafter. Commerce is in this respect like any other occupation. If it grants a sufficient livelihood, it is better than begging. In categorizing types of trade, al-Ghazzālī suggested, however, a certain negative attitude. The two basic types of trade, in his

view, were trade which is injurious to the individual and trade which is injurious to the society. The market place was, as al-Zabīdī's anecdote indicated, a place of *jihād* within men's souls. Certain types of men, al-Ghazzālī urged, would do well to refrain from trade; for example, the pious, the mystics, the learned, and the officials.⁴⁷ Al-Zabīdī's approval of commercial activities was, however, that of a learned, pious Ṣūfī in close contact with, and benefiting from, the involvement in trade of the local officialdom of his day.

Al-Zabīdī was not alone among the leading Ṣūfī reformers in supporting trade. The Shaykh al-Azhar, 'Abdullah al-Sharqāwī, quoted a *ḥadīth* from Ibn 'Abbās to the effect that, if Adam was an artisan, Noah a merchant, Idrīs a tailor, and Moses a herder, this shows that profit cannot be a denial of religiosity.⁴⁸ Al-Sharqāwī's position on the "most beneficial of occupations" is an interesting equivocation. The choice he poses is between trade and farming. In turning to *ḥadīth* literature, al-Sharqāwī took it up in order to discuss which was best: work by hand or work by craft. He concluded that, while some say that agriculture is best from the point of view of general utility, this differs according to circumstances; for example, while there are large numbers of people involved in some cases, in other circumstances this is not the case.⁴⁹ That the Bakriya should in their writings justify their commercial activities would seem obvious from the previous discussion of the period. On occasion it was referred to in passing as a matter of course.

Muṣṭafā al-Bakrī, the reformer who renewed the order in Egypt, wrote in one essay: "And then we passed by the tomb of the Shaykh, the reformer, the beloved, the possessor of good fortune, 'Alī the owner of a cow, may God protect his soul. And this cow was buried next to him. We read in this place the *fatiḥa* imploring God Almighty that our trade should be profitable."⁵⁰ Al-Bakrī also claimed that visiting tombs was important because anything we pray for from a saint at the tomb is from God, because saints do not cut their relations with this world after death.⁵¹ An even more radical statement of this type comes from the son of an eighteenth-century Ṣūfī. He claimed that a mosque was like a place of trade (*maḥall tijāra*) in which is present the voice of God and Islam and in which both the rich and poor benefit.⁵²

More examples could be adduced from the *ḥadīth* literature of the period, defending or praising commerce. One can also find a number of examples of *multazimīn* who studied *fiqh* rather than *ḥadīth*. Here the distinction between Ṣūfī and non-Ṣūfī does not seem to have been so important.⁵³ Among those *multazimīn* who were prominent *fuqahā'* (systematic theologians) was Muḥammad al-Amīr al-Kabīr, a Ṣūfī who also wrote works in *ḥadīth*. Muḥammad al-Amīr was of Maghribi origin, but for two generations his family had been *multazimīn* in Upper Egypt, in the village of Sanabū near Asyūt. Muḥammad al-Amīr studied Hanafī *fiqh* and other rational sciences with Ḥasan al-Jabartī and with al-Jabartī's student Muḥammad b. Isma'īl al-Nafrāwī. He became *muftī* of the Malīkīs and wrote a

number of works in Mālikī *fiqh*, such as "Al-Majmū'a," and even a commentary on Ḥanafī law.⁵⁴ Hasan al-Jabartī was a Ḥanafī *faqīh*. He was a *multazim* in the village of Abidūs in Upper Egypt and independently wealthy, or so one infers from his numerous "withdrawals" from teaching at al-Azhar. His decision to teach at home was based on his possession of a large family library.

There were others who appear to have been landlords and students of *fiqh* rather than *ḥadīth*. One was Mūsā al-Sirī al-Shāfi'ī al-Azharī (died 1804/1219). He studied the rational sciences and grammar. Thereafter he bought land in al-Minūfiya, including mills and farmlands, and became al-'Arūṣī's expert on writing *fatāwī*.⁵⁵

An Effort to Measure the Revival

The Bakriya Khalwatiya and the Wafa'iya were more actively involved in the study of *ḥadīth* than in any other subject. From a statistical point of view, there is no doubt that *ḥadīth* studies was by far the most popular field in eighteenth-century writing.⁵⁶ Within *ḥadīth* studies, collections of *ḥadīth* were by far the most numerous, but a number of specialized studies also appeared. The principal works of *ḥadīth* used in the eighteenth century were those by al-Bukhārī; Muslim was much less used. Following the listings of the "Ṣaḥīḥ" of al-Bukhārī in the annotated catalog of al-Azhar, one finds listed some 384 copies. The great bulk of these date from after the advent of printing (i.e., from the late nineteenth century) and can thus be ignored for our purposes. With regard to the manuscript copies, which date back to the sixth Islamic century, it is noteworthy that the vast majority date from the twelfth Islamic century. Between 1737/1150 and 1814/1230, there are twenty-five copies. Between 1494/900 and 1688/1100, there are two. There are ten from the ninth Islamic century (this number would be increased by four if the end of the eighth century and the beginning of the tenth century were included).⁵⁷

A similar trend is noticeable in the commentaries on al-Bukhārī. Al-Qastallānī's "Irshād al-Sārī" has fourteen copies from the twelfth Islamic century, none from the period between 1511/917 and 1680/1091. The mosque's holdings of other commentaries are much smaller. In the case of Ibn Ḥajar, "Fath al-Bārī," only four out of forty-three manuscripts are dated. Of these, two are from the ninth century, one from the eleventh century, and one from the early twelfth century. Al-'Aynī's "'Umdat al-qārī'" has a total of thirty-five copies, mainly printed, and no dated manuscript copy.⁵⁸ From these findings it is clear that, insofar as number of copies from a given period indicates use, and use indicates importance, the fifteenth, the eighteenth, and the late nineteenth centuries were the periods of most active interest in the principal works on *ḥadīth*.

A search through the catalog for the works in *ḥadīth* studied in Egypt during the seventeenth century led to the conclusion that, apart from such major collections as al-Bukhārī, there was only one work of major impor-

tance in the entire century, the *Bayqūniya*.⁵⁹ This book is three pages long in a printed edition, written in rhymed prose. It briefly mentions the different types of *ḥadīth*, for example, strong and weak *ḥadīth*, broken and unbroken chains of transmission, and so on. The book was obviously a primer, meant to be memorized, and perhaps was modeled on a famous work of the late seventeenth century in 'aqīda (dogmatics), the *Jawhara* of Ibrāhīm al-Laḳānī. The *Bayqūniya* remained a standard work until at least the early nineteenth century in al-Azhar and the mosque centers of the Maghrib.⁶⁰ Many commentaries were of course written on this elementary work, for it was necessary to expand upon and explain the material. The most important seventeenth-century commentary on the *Bayqūniya* was written by Sīdī Muḥammad al-Zurqānī. Al-Zurqānī, who wrote in 1667/1080, stated that the purpose of the field of *ḥadīth* was to deal with literally everything from the whale in the sea to the bird in the sky. In undertaking the commentary, he stated that, despite his training, he had no other works available.⁶¹ More advanced students had to go beyond the capsulization for the sake of memorization, and in the course of the eighteenth century this led to a number of long explications or glosses (*ḥawāshī*). The absence of these in the seventeenth century is an indication that *ḥadīth* studies had, with a few exceptions, declined to an elementary level.

The Rise in Critical Consciousness in Scholarship

There were several manifestations in the later eighteenth century of a rise in critical consciousness. We shall explore them here through a discussion of the single best-known figure, Muḥammad al-Zabīdī, a Māturīdite *muḥaddith*. In al-Zabīdī one finds the origins of the nineteenth-century scientific outlook of figures like Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār and Rifā'a al-Taḥṭāwī. To attempt to give an account of the single most important writer of this period, even in *ḥadīth* alone, would be a very large undertaking, so great was the number of his writings, so numerous his students, so extensive his travels and contacts. It is clear from his own statements that he studied *ḥadīth* in India with Shāh Walī'ullah, from whom he received an *ijāza*, and that he had also studied in the Ḥijāz.⁶² His arrival in Cairo in 1754/1167 was portrayed by al-Jabartī as one of the great moments in the intellectual life of the eighteenth century. Al-Jabartī, his student, may have exaggerated,⁶³ but exaggeration or not, the range of his activities and the number of his students were certainly very considerable. This is apparent even from the few sources which have been located.⁶⁴ Unlike most other 'ulama', he had Turkish and Mamlūk students: for example, 'Allāma Muṣṭafā Efendī al-Qayṣūrī,⁶⁵ Amīr Ḥasan Bey Sīrbawwābīn,⁶⁶ and Shaykh Yūsuf al-Dīyār-bakarlı (died 1193), who came in his very old age.⁶⁷ Another student was Muṣṭafā Efendī, known as Bek Zadeh, who studied *al-Ḥadīth al-musalsal bi'l-awwālīya* with him, with all its conditions (*shurūṭ*).⁶⁸ Among his Egyptian and Arab students in *ḥadīth* were Shaykh Ibn al-Iklās b. Salīm b. Salāma b. Yūsuf al-Wardānī al-Shāfi'i al-Muhammadi,⁶⁹ Muhammad Sādiq

b. Aḥmad al-Nakhlī al-Ḥanafī, who came to Egypt to study with al-Zabīdī,⁷⁰ and Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Firqī al-Zakī, who studied *al-Ḥadīth al-musal-sal bi'l-awwalīya*.⁷¹ Another was 'Allāma Yūsuf b. Aḥmad al-'Aqqād al-Dimashqī.⁷² Three Egyptian students are mentioned: Aḥmad al-Sijā'ī, Sulaymān al-Akrāshī, and Muṣṭafā al-Ṭā'ī.⁷³ Al-Zabīdī traveled extensively in both the Ṣa'id (with which he maintained close relations and visited at least three times) and the Delta. On these trips he wrote and taught a volume which has been lost containing an Ijāza Rashīdiyya (an academic diploma to the people of Rosetta or Rashīd) which was supposedly reproduced in his "Alfiyat al-samt."⁷⁴ Apart from his teaching, al-Zabīdī was also famous for his research in *ḥadīth*. His research led him to write reference books which focused on questions relating to *nasab* (genealogy) and the meanings of words and terms.

Al-Zabīdī's great erudition and distinctive manner of teaching are often referred to as the reasons for his eminent stature in late-eighteenth-century Egypt. He used to teach *ḥadīth* presenting the complete chain of *rāwīs*, which he knew by heart, and following it by reciting lines of poetry.⁷⁵ As al-Zabīdī's reputation grew in Egypt, he shifted from the recitation of *ḥadīth* to the analysis of *ḥadīth*. This made for brilliant lectures which he would often give of an evening in the home of a notable. Another noteworthy feature was the presence of women and children in these sessions. The scribe would record whether they participated or merely listened.⁷⁶

A number of Wafā'ī Ṣūfīs who were influenced by al-Zabīdī participated in the revival of *ḥadīth* studies through their travels, which aided them in the study of *ḥadīth*, and through the study of ancillary disciplines, such as history, literature, and the language sciences. Among them, Muḥammad al-Ṣabbān was outstanding. So thorough are his works in grammar and the language sciences that they are still used, or at least well known, in Egypt today.⁷⁷ Al-Ṣabbān indicated that his intention in writing his main essay in *ḥadīth*, the "Manzūma . . . fī ḍabṭ asmā' rijāl ṣaḥīḥayn," was to correct the mistakes which he found in copies of Muslim's *Ṣaḥīḥ* and Mālik's *Al-Muwāṭṭā'* in the names of *rāwīs*. He said "I chose to focus on the problems concerning the *rāwīs* which I found in the books of the 'Thalāthiyāt,' and to correct them, that is, apart from mistakes in the copying. There are names which involve the use of non-Arabic letters, names which resemble other names . . . and we wish to give what is generally known about the name, its *laqab* [honorific name] and *kunya* [surname] and its lineage."⁷⁸ Al-Ṣabbān's criteria prefigure modern critical scholarship.

The Bakriya *shaykhs* were also extensively engaged in *ḥadīth* studies. Muḥammad al-Ḥifnāwī (also called al-Ḥifnī) taught Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Bidiri al-Dimyāṭī (known as Ibn Mayt) such works as the *Iḥyā'* of al-Ghazzālī, the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of al-Bukhārī, the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of Muslim, the *Sunnat Abī Dā'ūd* and *Al-Nisā'ī* of Ibn Māja, the *Al-Muwāṭṭā'* of Mālik, the *Musnad* of Ibn Hanbal, *al-Ma'ajim al-kabir*, *Al-Awsāt*, and *Al-Ṣaghīr* of al-Ṭabrānī, the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of Ibn Haban, the *Mustadrīk* of al-Nisabūri, and the *Ḥilyat* of Ḥafiz b. Na'im.⁷⁹ A disciple of al-Ḥifnāwī stated in the introduction to

another book that he (Aḥmad al-Dardīr) had been asked to specify the *asānīd* (chains) of the sound works in *ḥadīth* for an Ottoman *reis ül-kuttāb*.⁸⁰ This book dealt with *ḥadīth* by topics, for example, ritual purification, fasting in Ramadān, and so on. Another Khalwatī who has been referred to above, ‘Abdullah al-Sharqāwī, wrote a three-volume study based on *ḥadīth*, stating that “the best of sciences, after the Qur’ān itself, is the study of the *sunna* of the Prophet, because it is on this that the principles of judgment in the Sharī‘a are built.” He then listed a number of *ḥadīth* which give the science of *ḥadīth* study, *‘ilm al-ḥadīth*, priority over or equality with *fiqh*, for example, from Sufyān al-Thawrī.⁸¹ His scholarship combined rigor with pragmatism.

Conclusion

This chapter surveyed the religious framework of the cultural revival of the eighteenth century. The principal religious phenomenon of the period was the revival of Ṭarīqa Sūfism which took place during the second half of the eighteenth century. An analysis of this revival showed that it was juridically a reflection of the commercial revival of the same period. The characteristic form of literary expression among Sūfis was in *ḥadīth*. This was linked to the new commercial ethos in content and method.

The revival of the study of *ḥadīth* and the general rise in standards of religious scholarship were built on a broad scholarly foundation. *Ḥadīth* studies depended on a range of ancillary disciplines, including literature, language sciences, and history. As a consequence of the need for more specialized knowledge in these fields, religious scholars organized a new cultural institution within the *ṭarīqa*, the *majlis*. The function of the *majlis* was to serve as a meeting place for scholars and litterateurs. The role of the *majlis* and the developments which it encouraged in various fields is pursued in Chapter 3.

Chapter 3

The Cultural Revival of the Late Eighteenth Century: Literature, Language Sciences, and History

Ḥadīth studies has always been one of the most difficult of the fields within medieval religious studies. The process of evaluating the "soundness" of a given *ḥadīth*, which is sometimes criticized for its narrow formalism, nonetheless required a wide knowledge of a range of scholastic disciplines. Among the most important were those relating to language. These included in a formal sense the "language sciences," but more broadly literature and history. With the revival of the study of *ḥadīth* in the eighteenth century, there came a corresponding revival in these fields. The revival of their study marks an important turning point in the cultural history of Egypt. In this study, it is referred to as the indigenous origins of modern secular culture. The revival of these studies among the Wafā'iya and Bakriya reformers turned their *majlis* into a religiocultural institution, a literary salon. These *majālis* permitted the coming together of Azhar *shaykhs*, literary figures from outside the Azhar, and traveling scholars for frank interchanges free from the artificialities of formal situations.

While the main contours of the cultural revival were determined by the needs of the *ḥadīth* revival, as the movement progressed and patronage was increasingly extended (at least prior to 1790), developments in different fields can be seen which clearly go beyond fulfilling the needs posed by the revival of *ḥadīth*.

In literature, we find that the original purpose of the *majlis* (to revive literature in order to aid *ḥadīth*) was accomplished by a revival of the *Maqāmāt* of al-Ḥarīrī, which was studied and commented upon by several writers during this period. This led to several other developments: first, the study of the pre-Islamic sources of al-Ḥarīrī, which was necessary in order to understand him. Second, it led to individuals' emulating the *maqāma* as a model for a prose form. While the first such efforts were naturally clumsy, by the end of the eighteenth century a prose work of some merit had been produced. Likewise, the poetry of this period showed development. Alongside the dominant forms of insincere praise or mourning written in a heavy *saj'* (rhymed prose), there developed a poetry in which the poet wrote about his own feelings with obvious sincerity. In linguistic fields, a particularly large number of works were composed as "transmitted" sciences; for example, in lexicography writers produced works which emphasized the importance of the original sources for the meanings of words, and the knowledge of the chain of authorities through which the original sources had been re-

ceived. The study of grammar, in the hands of its leading student, likewise underwent a critical development. In some writings, there began a utilitarian critique of later medieval accretions and imprecisions in the grammar books which could be detected with a precise knowledge of *ḥadīth*. The sciences of language style, especially rhetoric, made a dramatic revival during the eighteenth century. These were particularly needed for the *talqīn* (instruction) in the *inshād* (recitation). Historical studies also made a notable revival during the eighteenth century. The first major theme which was developed, through the study of the Battle of Badr, was the unique importance of the *ṣaḥāba* al-Badrīyīn. (The battle is discussed more fully later in this chapter under "History.")

As the middle class prospered and the salon flourished, the medieval court culture began to give way. The *maqāma*, as will be shown in Chapter 4, began to develop toward something like a novel. History became the history of the middle classes and even of the guilds. It was no longer merely dynastic history. Language sciences began to be related more to language as it is and has been and not language as it should be. The most important general development was the nascent sense of critical consciousness which was to grow and guide the neoclassical revival. These were some of the main attributes of the first phase of the indigenous development of a modern culture in Egypt.

Literature

The first phase of the revival of Arabic literature reflected very closely the milieu in which it was being studied. The dominant note of *ḥadīth* studies created the direction and mood. Judging from some of its poetry, the *majlis* of Ridwān was still like the Bakriya of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Its poetic expression contained much of the artificiality and dull repetition of the poetry of formal occasions. With the rise of the *majlis* al-Wafā'iya, a very considerable broadening of literary activity took place. The needs of the *ḥadīth* movement had a certain precedence, but the developments resulting from the studies of Ḥarīrī which were pursued in the service of *ḥadīth* studies were significant. The *maqāma* began to emerge as a prose form. The tradition of poetry of praise was continued but with the difference that in the context of the Ṣūfī *ṭarīqa* it did not have the same artificiality as it did in a court.

The first literary salon to be organized, the *majlis* of Ridwān, lasted some fifteen years (from 1738/1152 to 1753/1167). It was founded by Al-Amīr Ridwān al-Jalī, who offered annual prizes to poets. Many of the participants were early students of the Bakriya-Khalwatiya *shaykh* Muḥammad al-Ḥifnāwī: for example, Muḥammad b. Ridwān al-Suyūṭī (died 1766/1180), who wrote wine poetry in imitation of Abu Nuwwas. Al-Suyūṭī reserved his best panegyric efforts for the Khalwati *shaykh*.¹ Another prominent member of Amir Ridwan's circle who studied with al-Ḥifnawī was Ahmad

‘Abdullah b. al-Salāma al-Idkāwī (died 1770/1184). He wrote *maqāmāt*, including two for his patrons, ‘Abdullah al-Shubrāwī and Muḥammad al-Ḥifnāwī. He was described as the “poet laureate” of the salon; among his literary activities was the collecting of the poems written in honor of the Amīr Ridwān, which he gathered together in a work called “Al-fawā’ih al-jināniya fi’l-madā’ih al-Ridwāniya.” This book contained only some of these poems, for it is described as being a collection of those poems which were written by the Amīr’s North African guests. Al-Idkāwī also attempted to imitate the *Maqāmāt* of al-Ḥariri, although poorly, and he composed a work called “Bida’t al-arīb fi shi’r baḍā’i al-gharīb.”²

Shaykh Muṣṭafā As‘ad al-Laḳīmī al-Dimyātī, who wrote wine poetry, also frequented the salon. There were many other figures, but by mid-century these had nearly all died, and the circle presumably collapsed sometime after 1753/1167 with the death of the Amīr.

The formation of the Wafā’iyya salon, the first modern cultural institution of Egypt, occurred very soon thereafter. Although the salon of the Wafā’iyya was smaller, there can be no question that it played a more significant role in the history of Egypt than did its predecessor, notwithstanding that some of the same figures participated in both.³ The *majlis* al-Wafā’iyya was characterized by two emphases, its interest in later Andalusian culture and its interest in mystical poetry, especially that of Fātimid Egypt. This latter interest gave to some of the poems of the Wafā’iyya an extraordinary emotionality and a sense of drama generally lacking in the dominant rhymed prose (*saj‘*) for which poets in the later courts received patronage. This is not to say that a master of *saj‘* could not use it with a biting realism but that, in general, poetry and prose became richer and more complex in cultures which had a strong middle class, and conversely. This dual-cultural orientation mirrored the division within the salon between Egyptians and Maghāribā. As Maghribī power declined generally in Cairo, the salon became “Egyptian.”

One of the main figures of the Wafā’iyya salon was al-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī al-Badrī al-‘Awdī (died 1809/1224). Al-Ḥasan was an Egyptian Qur’ān reciter who followed his father in this profession. He spent his life in al-Azhar in the Riwāq al-Arwām. He also taught in the neighboring mosque of Sayyidnā al-Ḥusayn, which came under the influence of the Wafā’iyya after the Ottoman invasion of 1786. Among his students was ‘Alī Bey al-Daftardār. The extent of al-‘Awdī’s understanding of Wafā’iyya mysticism is not known, apart from a brief reference to his knowing the “names” and his capacity for *kashf* (illumination). Al-‘Awdī was a scholar of literature. He compiled one of the most important works of the period, “Al-Lawā’ih al-anwāriyya” (Dār al-Kutub manuscript 1419 Adab). This work collected the major poems written in praise of Muhammad Abī Anwār al-Sādāt. Al-‘Awdī’s other writings included a number of essays and a *Dīwan*, which remain unlocated. He was also remembered for a quarrel with Muhammad al-Amīr, the *muftī* of the Malīkīs. Al-‘Awdī is said to have remarked that al-Amīr’s surprise at his own view on the matter of *al-najasa* (ritual impurity)

was related to the fact that al-Amīr was a foreigner!⁴ Al-'Awdī was a close friend of several other literary figures who collectively formed the *majlis*, for example, Qāsim b. 'Aṭā'ullah, who was known for literary activity. Qāsim was widely read in literature and history, apparently a result in part of his studies in *ḥadīth*, a field in which he was also distinguished. In his youth he memorized *Al-Mulḥa*, *Al-Alfiya*, and other works in literature and the language sciences, as well as popular Arabic poetry forms of *zaghāl* and *muwashshaḥa*. In the latter he became known as the most famous of his generation. In the book of al-'Awdī mentioned above, Qāsim's poetry in praise of Muḥammad Abī Anwār reflects his mastery of these genres and of the mystical themes of the *Wafā'*. He referred to al-Sādāt as the center of the Aqṭāb of his age, as possessing a *wilāya* (guardianship) on the authority of the *ṣaḥāba*, that is, Āl Ṭaha. This poetry, which was written in the *majlis*, contrasts sharply with the conventional literary products of the day, such as his early poem praising Ridwān Katkhudā al-Jalī.⁵

A third literary friend of al-'Awdī and the others who frequented the *majlis* al-Wafā'iya was Muḥammad b. Ridwān al-Suyūṭī, known as Ibn al-Ṣalāḥī (died 1766/1180). He came from the Delta; his mother's family had wealth in Damietta, where he was born in 1727/1140. Among his teachers was Muḥammad al-Ḥifnāwī, with whom he studied literature, handwriting, and lexicography. He was a friend of one of al-Zabīdī's students named Aḥmad al-Sijā'i, and on al-Sijā'i's death he wrote a *qaṣīda* of mourning. Earlier he had had a literary encounter with al-Sijā'i on the subject of "*al-lughz al-Damāmīnī fī'l-fā'il*," in which he addressed the '*ulamā'*' of India and al-Sijā'i replied in an essay which has never been located. There is a *qaṣīda* praising Muḥammad al-Ḥifnāwī, another praising Muḥammad Abī Anwār. Two poems cited by al-Jabartī refer to coffee drinking. They are complemented by some wine poetry and even love poetry built on the imagery of *ḥashīsh*: "*alqāki wa fī ḥashīshatī al-ashwāq*." Couplets in *rajaz* metre which were recited in the *majlis* al-Wafā'iya are quoted.⁶

The last person to be dealt with here was a member of the salon in later years. He was one of its most significant poets and one of the most committed followers of Muḥammad Abī Anwār. He was Isma'īl al-Khashshāb, or Isma'īl Wahbī (died 1815/1230). We shall deal here with his *Diwān*, which shows his imaginative abilities and may be used to show the impact of the *majlis* al-Wafā'iya on the development of the younger writers of the late eighteenth century, among whom were also Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār and 'Abd al-Raḥman al-Jabartī.⁷

The most important part of the *Diwān* was the poetry in which he praised Muḥammad Abī Anwār al-Sādāt. It is poetry written by a young man to an older man whom he loved and admired, and despite the *saj'* form, al-Khashshāb achieved a warmth and sincerity rarely found in eighteenth-century poetry. He praised al-Sādāt's house as a center of civilization, a place of relaxation for the traveler. He called al-Sādāt the leading spiritual figure of his age and referred to him as the chosen legatee of the divine (*al-wārith al-mukhtār*), the one who has been appointed by God to lift the

gloom of the Eastern night. He also alluded to his divine spiritual powers (*awwalī al-taqwa, dhū'l-'ulyā*). Referring to al-Sādāt's connection through the house of Wafā' to the Prophet, al-Khashshāb spoke on the occasion of the birth of a son to al-Sādāt of the child's inheriting the light from his father.⁸ These and many other images were used by al-Khashshāb as he sought to describe al-Sādāt and the Ṣūfī literary milieu of the Wafā'. Al-Khashshāb possessed a degree of aesthetic sensibility which responded to the imagistic possibilities in mystical life; he conveyed these as vividly as his craft permitted. Al-Khashshāb, however, like others of his age, was struggling not only with the enormous problem of the fitness of language, but also with the fact that no public existed outside the small salon to read what he had written. He worked all his life in government employment and wrote numerous poems in traditional genres for those who paid him to do so.

The tragedy of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries which affected the creative lives of both al-Khashshāb and al-ʿAṭṭār was the weakening of the indigenous segment of the middle class, which had supported the salon tradition, and with this decline the reversion to a "court culture." This occurred in the time of their early manhood. Al-ʿAṭṭār left Egypt for Turkey and Syria, where he stayed thirteen years, during which he hazily studied literature and wrote less and less, as we shall see in Chapter 5. Al-Khashshāb stayed in Egypt and died in 1815/1230. After the death of al-Khashshāb, new genres entered the literature, such as the poetry of the bureaucratic age, the *waṭanīyāt*; but it would be difficult to find an Egyptian poet again before the middle of the nineteenth century who struggled so hard and so sincerely to express personal feelings.

The salon had served as the principal vehicle through which literature was revived, discussed, and in many cases emulated. An outstanding example is the *maqāma* of al-Ḥarīrī. Its study was revived in Egypt by a Maghribī litterateur in the late seventeenth century. For certain linguistic purposes, al-Ḥarīrī served throughout the eighteenth century. Interest in the *maqāma* form steadily developed. Religion was scarcely the reason for the choice of a Jewish Andalusian model by one Egyptian *shaykh* for editing and by another for emulation. Even al-Zabīdī, who did much to train students in linguistics by having them memorize parts of al-Ḥarīrī, revealed at the time of the death of his wife that it was the pre-Islamic tribal background in al-Ḥarīrī which drew him.

The classical *maqāma* was a prose form in which jugglery of words and verbal gymnastics dominated concern for content. According to modern scholarship, its greatest practitioner was al-Hamadhānī.⁹ Significantly, however, al-Ḥarīrī enjoyed the greatest popularity, especially in the post-caliphate period. After a general decline in the writing of Arabic commentaries on *maqāmāt* literature in the thirteenth century, there was a revival of studies on al-Ḥarīrī in Egypt in the late seventeenth century. The initiator of this revival was Shihāb al-dīn al-Khafājī (died 1653/1069), who wrote on al-Ḥarīrī and also composed *maqāmāt* of his own.¹⁰

In the eighteenth century a large number of writers turned their attention to al-Ḥarīrī's *Maqāmāt*, such a large number that the phenomenon deserves special attention.¹¹ Leaving aside for a moment the contribution of the main figure in this revival, Muḥammad Murtaḍā al-Zabīdī, we shall begin with other writers of the same period. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Kuthnawī al-Dānīrānkawī (1742/1155) memorized the *Maqāmāt* for linguistic reasons with Shaykh Muḥammad Fūdū, who taught him literature and grammar for four years. This student became a teacher and later a time-keeper.¹² Ḥasan al-Jabartī wrote a long commentary on the *Maqāmāt* which he taught to the *bey*s.¹³ The son of 'Abdullah al-Shubrāwī possessed numerous copies of the commentaries on the *Maqāmāt al-Ḥarīrī*, such as the one by al-Zamakhsharī and others.¹⁴ Another person mentioned above in connection with the salons, a poet named Aḥmad b. 'Abdullah al-Salāma al-Idkāwī, also memorized parts of the *Maqāmāt al-Ḥarīrī*.¹⁵ Yet another person was Alī b. 'Abdullah al-Rumi, originally the Mulla Darwish Agha, known as Muharram Efendi Bash. In his youth he studied handwriting as a craft with the famous teacher Ḥasan al-Dīyā'ī, taking an *ijāza* for his skill. When he came to Egypt he had serious discussions with a student of Shihāb al-Khafājī named Muḥammad b. 'Umar al-Khuwānkī, called the *adīb*, or litterateur, of his age. Al-Rumi memorized parts of this man's writings, including a historical work called "Asmā' ahl al-Badr," along with parts of the *Maqāmāt al-Ḥarīrī*. He also edited al-Zabīdī's work on the Battle of Badr (see below) and studied *ḥadīth* with him.¹⁶ Another student of al-Zabīdī was 'Alī b. 'Abdullah b. Aḥmad al-'Alawī al-Ḥanaḥī (died 1784/1199). He studied language and literature with al-Zabīdī; among the works he studied was the *Maqāmāt al-Ḥarīrī*.¹⁷

Finally, there was al-Zabīdī himself. Al-Zabīdī drew vast numbers of students to his lectures. One account which is much celebrated in the biographical literature is that of the decision of a high Ottoman official to come to Egypt in order to study with al-Zabīdī. It is said that this person, 'Abd al-Rāziq Efendi, would go to al-Zabīdī with the difficult passages after he had finished his lessons with other *shaykhs*. He read the *Maqāmāt al-Ḥarīrī* with al-Zabīdī, who would simplify it for him.¹⁸

Al-Zabīdī's study of al-Ḥarīrī led him to study the pre-Islamic and early Ommayyad sources of the Arabic language which al-Ḥarīrī himself had drawn on.¹⁹ When his wife died, al-Zabīdī mourned her in poetry written in the fashion of Majnūn Layla, which was unheard of in Ottoman Egypt to that point.²⁰ Al-Zabīdī's study of Majnūn Layla in the Jāhiliya (pre-Islamic) period brings out the more radical equality of sexes found in tribal contexts than in some urban situations. While it was shocking to al-Zabīdī's contemporaries, it was symptomatic of trends in sexual relations in the later eighteenth century. In this unusual period, women did appear in the chronicles. In the reversals of the nineteenth century, this ceased to be the case. Al-Zabīdī in fact wrote numerous works on tribal history and genealogy, drawing information from his travels among the tribes. The tribes who

spoke a purer Arabic than that of Egypt in his day also supplied him with information on language, which was vital to his *ḥadīth* studies.²¹

The revival of interest in al-Ḥarīrī had another consequence for the development of eighteenth-century literature, namely, the revival of the *maqāma* as a literary genre. Not surprisingly, the early attempts at emulation were generally disappointing, although not more than two or three have been studied by modern scholars. From those which have been surveyed, it is a great leap to the brilliant prose work of al-ʿAṭṭār, *Maqāmat al-ʿAṭṭār* (which will be discussed in Chapter 4).²²

In the eighteenth century, literature in Egypt was studied and composed by *shaykhs* of al-Azhar. Despite the participation of the Ṣūfī salons in the literary culture, it bore the marks of its scholastic environment. While this environment was not the most conducive to creativity, it was a supportive environment for the writing of commentaries on classical and literary works and for the editing and reintroduction of old texts. One example of this was the work of Shaykh Aḥmad al-Sijāʿī, who wrote "Bulūḡ al-ārāb bi sharḥ qāṣida min kalām al-ʿarab (Qāṣidat al-Samuwʿal b. ʿĀdiyāʿ al-Ghassānī al-Yahūdī)" (1763/1177).²³

The Language Sciences: Lexicography, Grammar, and Style

In the study of lexicography, al-Zabīdī retained close and continuous relationships with travelers to and from North Africa. In grammar, Muḥammad al-Ṣabbān wrote on the Andalusian Ibn Mālik. The object of his very popular work was the commentator al-Ashmūnī, much more so than the text, which had in any case been criticized in North Africa by figures like Ibn Khaldūn. Muḥammad al-Amīr, who did retain close links with his North African origins, wrote on Ibn Hishām. But his interest seemed to be more the critique of the commentator Khālid al-Azharī. Al-Ṣabbān's discussion focused on the use of *ḥadīth* by al-Ashmūnī. Finally, with regard to style, the principal writings reflected the use of these works within Ṣūfī circles. The new epistemology of the *ḥadīth* movement emerged clearly in all these fields. These works mark a break with the past.

Philological control over the meaning of individual words was always much less than that over the rules of discourse. Thus in lexicography, al-Zabīdī taught the classic lexicographers, such as al-Thaʿālibī and al-Bāqillānī, who argued that the knowledge of conventional meanings is not enough for making proper word combinations; one must also know the actual usage.²⁴ In the early nineteenth century, Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār, whose studies were primarily in the rational sciences, avoided lexicography.²⁵

The heightened interest in lexicography in eighteenth-century Egypt can be witnessed from the fact that six out of the ten copies of a standard dictionary in al-Azhar's library were made in the eighteenth century. This is a large number in view of the small total number of dictionaries.²⁶ The study

of lexicography in eighteenth-century Egypt was integral to the work of the *muḥaddithīn*. It was characterized by the same concern for precise linkage of meanings to their origins. It sought to achieve this through the study of literary sources and the observation of actual usage.

Chronologically, the first student of lexicography was Muḥammad b. al-Ṭīb al-Fāsī (1698/1110–1756/1170). He lived most of his life in Madīna, where he studied *ḥadīth*. He wrote a major work on lexicography, and his principal student was al-Zabīdī.²⁷ Al-Ṭīb began his study by stating that when defining words his intent was to give the most important meaning and to avoid strange and remote meanings, such as one would find in some of the glosses. This was because he wished to facilitate the study of *ḥadīth* and *tafsīr* (commentary on the Qurʾān). He further stated that he wished to correct the mistakes which he found in these two fields in particular, which he called the noble sciences, the “*ulūm al-sharīfa*.”²⁸ He then began the commentary on the basic text, on which he had grave reservations. Al-Ṭīb differed markedly with al-Firūzabādī, the author of the great medieval dictionary, the *Qāmūs*, over the value of the *Ṣiḥāḥ* of al-Jawhārī. The disagreement centered on the use of *ḥadīth* sources.²⁹

The commentary on the *Qāmūs*, called *Tāj al-ʿarūs* by al-Zabīdī, is one of the most important works of the eighteenth century. Moreover, it has been in continuous use up to the present day among students and scholars.³⁰ Al-Firūzabādī had modeled his work on the *Ṣiḥāḥ* of al-Jawhārī but included numerous root combinations which al-Jawhārī had omitted. These were written in by al-Firūzabādī in red. Al-Zabīdī carried this process further and included root combinations which al-Firūzabādī did not include. The issue at stake concerned the problem of the genuine existence of a word. For al-Zabīdī, as for other philologists, especially in the context of the religious revival, the language of the Qurʾān was nearly as sacred as the revelation of the Qurʾān. Lexicographers had been led by this belief to calculate the possibilities in each known root. Al-Zabīdī sought to trace the source of every single word. In addition, he sought to overcome the traditional conflict between the conventional and actual meanings of words. Al-Zabīdī's preoccupation with the reconciliation of this conflict led him to undertake empirical research on a scale unparalleled in later Islamic history. When travelers came to Cairo, he would inquire of them their names, their tribes, and information on their origins. In this way he established such close relations with the North Africans that it became proverbial among them that to visit Cairo was to visit al-Zabīdī. The breadth of these contacts was illustrated on the occasion of the completion of one of his major works, when he sent copies literally across the Islamic world.³¹ Prior to his sojourn in Egypt, al-Zabīdī had traveled widely in the Arab world, especially among the tribes, where in his day the language was less corrupted than that which was spoken in the cities.

What degree of success al-Zabīdī had in his investigations of language among the tribes is not known. As has been pointed out in a recent article, the Ḥijāzī tribes, like the Quraysh, who were frequently used by philolo-

gists as a reference, had extensive "foreign" contacts; hence, their language might not be the purest. On the other hand, the study of the tribes and of tribal culture might show that their sense of history and their own historical mission served to keep them highly self-conscious in matters of language. The Wahhābis, for example, were widely respected for their knowledge of language and *ḥadīth*. The Quraysh might have preserved their language more successfully than tribes in the Arabian interior which had never played a similar historical role. In any case, it would be wrong to maintain that the "remote" tribes were not also used by philologists: among those that were studied were the Qais, Tamīm, and Asad.³²

Al-Zabīdī was the last lexicographer to cite his authority for every piece of information which he records. Many of these references were to previous lexicographical works, some fifty in all.³³ Al-Zabīdī's concern with the criteria of an acceptable entry led him even to list the chain of transmitters from himself back to Ibn Ḥajar, who took it orally from al-Firūzabādī.

Al-Zabīdī's criticism of the *Qāmūs* was that it sacrificed clarity for the sake of brevity. This made it difficult to use, at least in the fashion that al-Zabīdī wished to use a dictionary. His *Tāj*, with the text of the *Qāmūs* inserted in brackets, is about five times the size of the earlier work. Al-Zabīdī reinserted the *shawāhid* (sources), along with quotations from geographical and medical authorities, thereby increasing the amount of information on place names and persons beyond that given in the *Qāmūs*,³⁴ making the *Tāj* comparable to the O.E.D. in function.

Al-Zabīdī's profound influence on the development of lexicography in Egypt continued long after his death. This was especially true among later students of *ḥadīth*. However, he was not alone.³⁵ Al-Ṣabbān, who studied with al-Zabīdī, also combined *ḥadīth* studies with philology. Another writer contemporary with al-Zabīdī who worked in lexicography and *ḥadīth* was Fakhr al-dīn b. Muḥammad Ṭuwayḥ, who wrote "*Majma' al-baḥrayn wa maṭla' al-nīrayn*" (1757/1171), which was composed to cover the obscurities in the Qur'ān and *ḥadīth*.

While the early Ottoman period produced few really distinguished Egyptian grammarians, there was, however, a continuous production of treatises on grammar at al-Azhar. The main grammarians discussed by Carl Brockelmann—al-Zabīdī, al-Ṣabbān, and the seventeenth-century scholar al-Khafāji—are all from the later Ottoman period. The following chart gives the distribution of manuscripts which Brockelmann lists, by the century in which they were written.³⁶

	Century		
	16th	17th	18th
Supplement edition, vol. 2	5	10	12
First edition, vol. 2	5	6	7

From this listing, the importance of the later period can be deduced. Even for the field which was traditionally most aligned to the rational sciences,

it would seem that al-Šabbān was the most prominent grammarian of eighteenth-century Egypt. His works were used in the nineteenth and even the twentieth centuries.

The works of Ibn Mālik were studied intensively throughout the entire Ottoman period, if one may make a rough estimate from the number of dated manuscripts in the catalog of al-Azhar. The *Sharḥ al-Ashmūnī*, on which al-Šabbān wrote a gloss, was only one of many, although it was the most popular. The other principal work which was used in the eighteenth century in the field of grammar was written by Ibn Hishām and commented upon by Khālid al-Azhārī. In addition, there was a second work by Ibn Hishām which was also commented upon by Khālid, and a third work by Khālid which was a commentary on a composition of his own.

The school of Ibn Hishām was continued by al-Amīr in the 1790's. In the early nineteenth century, it was represented by Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār. At the same time, al-Šabbān had found Nūr al-dīn al-Ashmūnī "lean in understanding" and subject to "delusions of the mind" in his approach to grammar. He was particularly critical of al-Ashmūnī's treatment of *ḥadīth*.³⁷ In the following generation this critique was continued, although the points of concern were reversed. Al-Šabbān's student Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār was a *mutakallim*, a student of speculative theology. With al-'Aṭṭār, as I show in Chapter 4, the progress of utilitarianism becomes marked.

In the field of rhetoric, in particular, it would appear that the need to revive the study of this discipline in Egypt grew out of the requirements of *al-inshād* and *al-dhiḳr*. Prior to the eighteenth century, during the Ottoman period, there were very few writings in this field. In the eighteenth century, however, both the copies of classical works and the number of "independent" writings increased considerably. Prior to the eighteenth century, nearly all the glosses on the basic text of the postclassical period which was used in Egypt, the *Talkhīṣ al-miftāḥ* of al-Qazwīnī on the *Miftāḥ al-'ulūm* of al-Sakkākī, were by non-Egyptians. In the eighteenth century, *ḥawāshī* were composed by Muḥammad al-Ḥifnāwī and his brother Yūsuf (who were leading Khalwatis), by Muḥammad al-Šabbān (a Wafā'ī), and by Muḥammad ibn 'Arafa al-Diṣūqī (whose teacher in theology had been Aḥmad al-Dardīr).³⁸

Three Ṣūfī writers in eighteenth-century Egypt wrote on more limited themes and built on the medieval texts. Their works enjoyed a large popularity until the end of the nineteenth century. The first of these writers was Aḥmad al-Sijā'ī, who composed two works on the use of metaphors. Both were commentaries on his own compositions. A gloss was later written on one of them in the nineteenth century. The two principal figures were, however, Muḥammad al-Amīr and Muḥammad al-Šabbān. Al-Amīr's commentary on the text called *Al-Samarqandīya* (1778/1185) was frequently used. The writing of subcommentaries was common into the nineteenth century. The most influential work in this field was al-Sabbān's "Risāla fi'l-bayān."

One last work which was both the longest and one of the most detailed

studies of the period was based on the *Talkhīṣ al-miftāḥ*. It was written in some fourteen hundred pages and was finished three years before Napoleon invaded Egypt.³⁹ Other Egyptians who wrote during the eighteenth century and contributed to the revival of this field included Aḥmad al-Damanḥūrī, Muḥammad al-Kafrāwī, ‘Abdullah al-Shubrāwī, and Ḥasan al-‘Aṭṭār.

In conclusion, the revival of the study of style in the eighteenth century was part of the larger body of “new” writings by Ṣūfī *shaykhs*. In some cases their practical application is particularly clear. The art of rhetoric was of great importance in the context of the Ṣūfī *dhikr*. In fact, Muḥammad al-Ḥifnāwī, the famous *khalīfa* of the Bakriya, was himself responsible for a number of innovations in communication in Egypt. It is said that he turned to the use of *mawwāl*, colloquial poetry often sung to the accompaniment of a reed pipe. Al-Ḥifnāwī’s solution to the problem of effective communication across class lines was a considerable achievement. Before the eighteenth century, the Azharīs had never had to confront the lower classes in large numbers. One may infer what was meant by the description of a basic text in ‘*ilm al-waḍ’*, the rules of composition, as written for the sake of “matters related to the hearts” in this context.⁴⁰ A parallel conclusion is that, because other fields, such as the formal rules of poetry, did not share the needs for cross-class communication, they did not participate in the eighteenth-century revival.⁴¹

History

In the eighteenth century, Egypt began its transition from a tributary mode to modern periphery capitalist society. Two types of historical writing co-existed during this era and reflected this transition. One school represented the old ruling groups which were suffering upheaval; the other reflected the rise of the new, commercially oriented middle classes.

In their pure form, these two principal genres reflect, both in method and in content, different social realities. The chronicle of the deeds of the upper classes, written in imitation of Turkish dynastic history, recorded the sequence of events (*akhbār*) during the reign of each Ottoman Pasha. The middle classes, on the other hand, were interested in explaining their own changing situation rather than in writing chronology. As has previously been mentioned, their mode of analysis was derived from *ḥadīth* studies. Their concern was with morality, both individual and social, although there was no artificial separation in their thinking. The social aspect (insofar as practices were concerned) has been discussed above. Here our concern will be with awareness of the historical decline of Islam and its contemporary weakness. The middle-class study of history, unprecedented in its choice of subject matter and the intensity of its commitment, was an attempt at self-understanding through focusing on the Battle of Badr, which for the first time in Islamic history was studied, in Egypt, as an independent subject. The concern of these historians was to learn how the Prophet was able to

emerge victorious from adverse conditions. The deepening of an analytical approach to history led to a revival of interest in the historical writing of Ibn Khaldūn. The naturalism of Ibn Khaldūn within a religious framework was acceptable to the Māturīdite outlook of the eighteenth century.

The reader may rightly ask at this point, why are studies in *‘ilm al-ḥadīth* being grouped with chronicle history during the eighteenth century, especially in view of the fact that the one grew out of the other in early Islamic times? The treatment of both types of writing as antecedents to modern historiography is deliberate. It reflects a conviction that the chronicle is the antecedent of only one kind of modern history. If one understands modern history as essentially a sequence of events and dates, then the chronicle form can rightly or wrongly be understood as a primitive antecedent of it. However, if one understands by modern history a science striving to achieve a holistic understanding of the human condition, then the choice of medieval antecedents would naturally be quite different. The latter concept of historical writing is not so tightly bound to a linear notion of time as is the "positivist" tradition of historiography.

In post-tenth-century Islam, a great concern with an integrated vision of reality was shown in the writings of Sūfis. In the Sūfī revival of the eighteenth century, a number of central themes from the life of the Prophet were revived. Through these themes, an attempt was made to understand the historical predicament of the eighteenth century. It is for this reason that these works are studied along with the chronicles.

The revival of interest in Ibn Khaldūn, al-Ṣabbān's concern with the careful use of *ḥadīth* in grammar, and al-Khashshāb's sincerity in poetry were manifestations of what has been called in Chapter 2 the rebirth of a critical consciousness among writers of the middle classes.

The chronicle literature of the Ottomans in eighteenth-century Egypt reflected the decline of the old order. Two works by members of the 'Azab corps, written during the eighteenth century at a time when the corps was extremely weak, create a romanticized image of society according to the norms of Ottoman rule a century earlier. One of these chronicles was written about 1751/1165 and begins with the author's explanation of why he was moved to write it: "I was asked by some comrades about the events of Egypt which concerned the Sanājiq, the Āghawāt, the Ikhtiyāriya . . . from the time of Sultan Sulaymān Khān down to Sultan 'Uthmān in 1754/1168, may he continue victorious; and I was asked about those who were sent as Pasha during this time to Egypt."⁴² The principle of organization was cyclical. The new Pasha would arrive in Alexandria on a given date with his entourage. He would then make his procession up the valley of the Nile through Rosetta to Cairo; this was a biennial reconquest of Egypt on a symbolic level. Along the way the officials and notables would make their gestures of obeisance. The only concession to Egypt, again purely symbolic, was the custom which apparently began in the eighteenth century, of his visit to the tomb of the Imām al-Shāfi'i. The chronicle then relates the major events of the Pasha's "reign."⁴³

One does not find in the Ottoman-style chronicle, as one does with al-Jabartī and the middle-class milieu, a particular concern with written sources. The Pasha's contact with "Egyptians" was very limited. One of the few references to an Egyptian was to an unnamed Naqīb al-Ashraf, who was also the Shaykh al-Rifā'iya (a Sūfī order). Commerce was not discussed, but there were references to the land tax.⁴⁴ A second work which dealt with the Pashas who served during the reign of each Sultan presented less the Ottoman theory of government and more the reality in its treatment of subjects, such as the rivalries of Dhū'l-Faqqār and the Qāsimiya and the attacks of the Bedouins.⁴⁵ The historical chronicle as a genre survived into the nineteenth century. One writer wrote a chronicle history of the Ottomans for the French and a similar chronicle for an Ottoman patron.⁴⁶

Middle-class historians wrote on historical themes which interested them directly. One such theme was the Battle of Badr. The historical details of the Battle of Badr were well enough known, and they do not fully clarify the reason for the singularly widespread interest it evoked in this period. In March 624/Ramaḍān of the year 2, a battle took place between Muḥammad's troops and the Meccans. Although outnumbered by perhaps one thousand to three hundred, Muḥammad was able to rally his army and put the Meccans to rout. Some seventy Meccans and fifteen Muslims were killed. Seventy Meccans were taken prisoner. The battle confirmed the Muslims' faith in Islam and perhaps should be seen first of all in this light. One theme which ran through the eighteenth-century writings on the Battle of Badr was the concern to ascertain the exact number of those who were fighting on the side of Muḥammad. In general, the eighteenth-century authors lowered the totals compiled by previous writers. These previous writers were not discussed: who they were and what their motives might have been for attempting to show that there were larger numbers of participants were not really dealt with. Is it possible that the eighteenth-century writers on the Battle of Badr felt a renewed sense of identification with the forces of Muḥammad? Did they feel that they, too, were struggling in a rather hostile environment against powerful odds?⁴⁷

Before considering whether this is a logical interpretation, we will present some examples of these writings. Muḥammad al-Ṣabbān wrote a short essay on this subject in 1757/1171 called "Manzūmat asma' ahl Badr."⁴⁸ Al-Ṣabbān also wrote a commentary on this work (the commentary was not located), and his student Muṣṭafā al-Banānī wrote a subcommentary on that.⁴⁹ Al-Banānī began his work by listing the sources which he intended to use. These included the "Sira" of Ibn Sayyid al-Nās called Nūr al-Nirās. He also stated that he would draw on his other teachers—'Abdullah al-Shubrāwī, Muḥammad al-Hifnāwī, and Shihāb al-dīn Aḥmad al-Ḥadramī. On folio 78B he begins a biography of al-Ṣabbān based on al-Jabartī and states that al-Ṣabbān studied the *Tafsīr al-Bayḍawī* with al-Shubrāwī and the *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* with al-Hifnāwī, as well as the *Mī'rāj* of al-Ghayṭī. On folio 79, he includes some of al-Ṣabbān's poetry in praise of Muḥammad Abī Anwār. The tone of this work is very different from that of the original:

the sense of urgency expressed by al-Ṣabbān in the earlier period is missing. From folio 82A on, al-Banānī follows al-Ṣabbān's organization, explaining the *aḥādīth* which al-Ṣabbān chose.

In another work on the same subject which was written in 1748/1162, the time of Muḥammad and the author's own era are linked through a general history of Islam from the time of the Battle of Badr until the age of Sultan Maḥmūd in 1748/1162.⁵⁰ The author stated that he intended to give the number of the companions of the Prophet, their names, what had been said concerning their divine blessings (*karāmāt*), and their fates. According to the author, the work was composed at the request of the Ottoman Pasha 'Abdullah in the year 1750/1164. He said on page 2, "It is said that a man reads what has happened in the past to know that which makes it unique and distinguishes it from what has existed from the beginning of time; so I put forward this collection, as examples." Chapter 2 dealt with the names of the Prophet's companions. Al-Shubrāwī stated that certain Ṣūfis had achieved spiritual cures through the recitation of these names, and that such recitation had helped merchants to succeed in commerce.

Muḥammad al-Ḥifnāwī, who wrote on the same theme sometime around 1759/1173, invoked the "path of guidance" for those who are engaged in a *jihād* for God's sake. Then he stated that he "had read some writings connected with the names of the Ahl al-Badr and that from among these writings were some which condensed or abridged the account without maintaining the necessary precision; while others were too long and went off the subject."⁵¹ He describes the Badrīyīn as the noblest group (*ʿaṣaba*) which has ever existed. "I chose to take as an example some of the most illustrious so as to dispel illusions." His method of concluding an argument was quite didactic: "Know that it has been agreed concerning the Badrīyīn that their number is 313, and whoever contests that is in opposition. Awṣil b. Sayyid in his book *ʿUyūn al-athār* found 363, including those who were martyred during the Battle and those who died after it. But of the latter there were only 14; six from the *muḥājirīn* and 8 from the *anṣār*."⁵² His line of attack was to challenge earlier works to explain how their total was arrived at, a total which should have been no more than 327. Al-Ḥifnāwī cited another source (Shaykh Aḥmad al-Munīnī al-Dimashqī) which listed 352. According to al-Ḥifnāwī, al-Munīnī was silent about the nature of his evidence.

After the initial discussion of sources, al-Ḥifnāwī discusses the Badrīyīn as individuals, using *ḥadīth* material. For example, there was 'Abdullah b. Suhayl, who was said to have died at the age of sixteen after proclaiming his desire to fight for God (p. 27); also Abū Ayyūb Khālīd b. Zayd al-Najjār, who went to the Prophet of God in Madīna, built a mosque and houses for him, and made his *jihād* for the Prophet until he died in the attack on Constantinople, where his tomb became a famous shrine which people visit seeking blessings—it is famous for its responses to petitions.

Methodologically, individualism is apparent in the approach to history taken by the eighteenth-century *ḥadīth* writers. The life of each of the

Badrīyīn is individually discussed. Only one author, in a very early Khalwatī work, referred to, much less treated, the Badrīyīn as an *‘aṣāba*. Through the reading of all the *ṣaḥāba*’s lives and virtues, a composite picture of human greatness emerges. No claim is made to its universality; no common theme is pursued in a linear fashion; no deductions or comparisons are permitted. This is the logic of context, which strives to create a coherent meaning out of particulars.

The impact of the *ḥadīth* revival went beyond those historical works which had an obviously pietistic inspiration. As in the case of literature, the religious revival provided a context in which a discipline began to emerge which was based increasingly on the study of classical models. In the case of history, this development was also stimulated by the demands of tribal chiefs for studies of their own family genealogies. The principal sources from which these works could be compiled were part of *ḥadīth* literature. However, the spirit of these genealogical works was distinctly secular.⁵³

One of al-Zabīdī’s principal students was Muḥammad Abī Ra’s al-Mu-‘askarī (died 1822/1239). He was known for many works in *fiqh*, *adab*, *tārīkh*, and *nasab*. He traveled widely in North Africa, the Arab East, and Turkey. His works included a *riḥla* (spiritual travel literature), two tribal histories, a work on the *ṣaḥāba* in the Maghrib, and one on *nasab*.⁵⁴

Apart from tribal genealogies, al-Zabīdī composed other more general works which transcended in breadth and vision the needs which religious scholarship per se would have imposed on them. Al-Zabīdī’s dictionary has been mentioned as an example of scholarship in philology; in history, his works include an enumeration of all the Ṣūfī orders of his day and a biographical work on travelers of the twelfth Islamic century.⁵⁵

The most important historian of the late eighteenth century besides al-Zabīdī was another Māturīdite reformer named ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Jabartī. In style and outlook, al-Jabartī’s main writings represent a synthesis of the two major trends in eighteenth-century historiography. At the same time, he marks a distinct step in the development of the neoclassical revival of Arabic culture.⁵⁶

His principal work was a chronicle which dealt in great detail with the history of the *beys* in the eighteenth century. But it also contained *tarājīm*, which were organized according to death dates and presented at the end of each year. These sections were written in the style of the *tarājīm* literature. Writing shortly after the French invasion, al-Jabartī was particularly explicit in the introductory passages of the first volume in his explanation of his concept of history.

It should be known that history is the science which determines and transmits knowledge of the conditions of different peoples, of their countries, their customs, their industries, their origins and their ends. . . . the first who established the chronological science in Islam was ‘Umar b. al-Khattāb, upon receiving a letter in which Abū Mūsā al-

Ash'arī drew his attention to the difficulty of determining dates.⁵⁷

As for his own "utilitarian" intentions in writing history:

The majority of these events [of twelfth and thirteenth century A.H.] are the cause of the unhappiness which we have suffered. . . . I wanted to make a collection of these few notes and to classify them chronologically in order to facilitate research, and so that the reader, by being instructed of past misfortunes, could find a salve for his suffering, finding as well the necessary experience to struggle against bad fortune!⁵⁸

Al-Jabartī was committed to working within the tradition of the chronicle despite the technical problems involved in writing in this genre in an age in which few such works had been composed, and those by Turkish soldiers and of little value. But al-Jabartī balanced his commitment to include a totally different historical tradition: one which was preoccupied with the moral and intellectual utility of the study of history. Its spokesmen were the *muḥaddithīn*. "[History] has as its object of study past generations: prophets, elected persons, 'ulamā', sages, poets, kings, sultans, and others. Its intent is to do research on the facts and circumstances in which [these] figures arose. Its utility lies in learning from the examples and from the counsel of history as well as the experience acquired from the study of diverse events."⁵⁹

In his stress on the utility of the study of history for its lessons and on the efficacy of struggling against bad fortune (a pagan concept), al-Jabartī naturally had to make some conscious reconciliation with the dominant Ash'arite tradition. Such a reconciliation was also needed to free him from the suggestion of Mu'tazilite learnings, a trend once known for speculative thinking untempered by dogmatic theology. This was the general problem of the Māturīdī reformer, and this explains his defense of the study of history in terms of its service to the religious sciences; his reaffirmation, albeit vague, of God's intervention in human affairs; and his concluding comments on God's kingdom on earth.

History is, besides, the source of several other sciences which could not exist without it. These include the study of *ḥadīth* sciences. It is the source for the reciters of the Divine Word, and for the commentators on it; for the study of the Companions, [*ṣaḥāba*], for jurisprudence, grammar, wisdom, literature, medicine, the study of the lives of the prophets . . . the lives of good men, of the sayings of kings, anecdotes, accounts, advice, instructive examples and proverbs, voyages, discussions of caliphs.⁶⁰

[And so]

The science of history is therefore a noble and edifying one which offers the wise man instructive examples drawn from the lives of people who have existed before him on this earth: God himself has mentioned in his Holy Book the history of the ancient nations, stating

that it was filled with instructive examples for the man endowed with sense. The prophet, too, has recounted several matters which belong to the history of past generations, such as some matters concerning the Israelites and the changes which they made in the Bible and the Gospels; and several other strange matters concerning the Arabs and other peoples. The Imām al-Shāfiʿī, may God be satisfied with him, also stated that the study of history develops the intellectual faculties.⁶¹

Finally, al-Jabartī discusses his concept of the social order. Society was a divinely ordained scheme which included five categories of man, hierarchically arranged. The first category are the prophets, God's apostles who bring messages. The second category are the *'ulamā'*, who are continuators of the tradition of the prophets and carry out their mission in their own lives by propagating the faith, "but occasionally corrupted by love of riches as in our own day!" The third category are the kings and other rulers; they create order and maintain justice and equity. This concept rests on the idea that man is by nature unjust. If he does not commit injustices, this is because he has been prevented from doing so: "Thus the principle of all government is justice, whether it be a Muslim government or not; and it is equally the source of all happiness." The fourth category contains those whom al-Jabartī classifies as being in the middle: that is, they observe justice in their relations with others; they render good for good and evil for evil. The fifth category includes those whom God has placed on earth who are still seeking for self-mastery, or attempting to establish control over their own passions.⁶²

It should now be clear that al-Jabartī's writing is characteristic of the eighteenth-century revival, and that his major work was in fact a "fusion" of previously existing trends. Thus, he is not, as is often claimed, a "unique" figure. In most important respects as a thinker and writer, he was a continuation of Māturidite reformism. A study of his ideas on history and the relationship of history to other disciplines clearly locates him within the late-eighteenth-century revival. In this period, a revival of classical fields was taking place in a profoundly religious atmosphere which nevertheless permitted elements of naturalism to enter.

Al-Jabartī's history clarifies certain points about the culture of the commercial revival which could not be settled from a study of the Badriyīn. It did so by situating biography within an ordering of events based on the calendar year. Al-Jabartī further suggests that the true order of history (the history of God on earth) requires a radical reassertion of the power of the *'ulamā'*, the continuators of the divine prophecy. Al Mawardī and most of "feudal" Sunnī political thought saw the kingship as the fusion of the secular and the spiritual, of *mulk* and *imāma*. Al-Jabartī, writing in an atmosphere of religious fervor, conditioned by the onslaught of the commercial age, separates the two, choosing perhaps influenced by Wafāʿī ideology and/or by a realization of the actual weakness of the central authority.

Al-Jabartī's greatness as a writer lay first in his presenting the fullest and

most coherent expression of the social ideas of the Egyptian commercial revival. Judged in this way, his work is the crowning masterpiece of the eighteenth-century reform movement of the *turuq*. In depth of analysis and sustained presentation, it surpasses even the writings of his teacher al-Zabīdī.

As a work of history, it has been approached by modern scholars, unaware of the unique methodological problems of his age, and as a result compared to classical or modern models. Where al-Jabartī was scrupulously honest in portraying (and portraying in minute detail) events which did not fit his main historical concerns—for example, in his account of the coming of the Europeans—he has been severely judged.⁶³

The question of style is somewhat beside the point—an observation I made in commenting on the eighteenth-century *maqāma*. The initial effort, artistic and otherwise, of locating, reading, and trying to evaluate classical models of culture was itself a stupendous achievement. It would seem that both al-Jabartī and al-Zabīdī were able to produce monuments far greater than their more polished and better known successors in later generations of the neoclassical revival.

Thus, while it lasted, especially during the years 1760–1790, a remarkable, and largely unstudied, cultural revival took place in Egypt. The range of subjects, the number of participants, and the rise in critical consciousness in scholarship which have here been sampled in a limited way make necessary a reinterpretation of the development of modern culture in Egypt. Clearly, the commercial revival of the eighteenth century triggered a renewal of vitality in the religious life of Egypt, which in turn gave birth to a nascent secular culture. Much remains to be said about the nature of secular culture and the trajectory of its development in a developing country. Such a discussion cannot be launched until the role of the indigenous reform movement and the role of the European cultural movement in Egypt have both been assessed, for secular culture is a resultant of both these two.

The logical continuation of this chapter is a chapter bridging the gap between the cultural revival of 1760–1790 and the succeeding phase in which the development of secular culture continued. This second phase took place during the Muḥammad ‘Alī period, and more specifically during the period of reform-minded bureaucracy from 1815 to 1837. The analysis also requires greater depth, for the argument from socioeconomic factors to cultural developments leaves out biography and simplifies the struggles within the period, as well as the tensions within individuals' lives, for the sake of concentration on the main trends.

The fourth chapter will begin a detailed biographical study of one of the major figures of nineteenth-century cultural reform in Egypt. He is virtually unknown to most of his own countrymen, except for some minor poetry which he wrote and for one or two isolated statements about reform. For almost a generation, vast attention has for various reasons been lavished on his student (one might almost say his disciple), Rifā‘a al-Taḥṭawī. Little or none of this attention has worn off on the teacher of al-Taḥṭawī. Ḥasan al-

'Aṭṭār. Al-'Aṭṭār is equally little known abroad, despite the fact that he had contact with numerous Europeans, wrote more than fifty books, and occupied an important position in his society. In al-Azhar itself, he is still known, for several of the textbooks which he wrote for his students are still used or have been used until recently. But the use of his texts, now 150 years old or more, has not awakened in the *shaykhs* of al-Azhar or the scholarly community at large a sense of the intellectual revolution which al-'Aṭṭār represented during the first quarter of the nineteenth century.

Chapter 4

The Decline of the Eighteenth-Century Cultural Revival: The Formation of Shaykh Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār

The major period of the eighteenth-century cultural revival was between 1760 and 1790. From 1790 to 1815, conditions in Cairo made scholarly life difficult. The warfare of the *beys* increased, and this in turn increased the social and economic problems faced by the rest of society. An inflationary situation was brought on by the artificial concentration of wealth in the form of unearned income in the city of Cairo at a time when there were no commensurate possibilities for investment. The inflow of foreign luxury goods and the growth of the service sector both served to undermine the artisanate; it was further beset by the inflationary situation. Finally, manipulation of food prices and hoarding of food outside Cairo created almost chronic social unrest. These conditions helped usher in a period of partial anarchy after the French invasion and then a further decade of instability during which a new social formation emerged. The indigenous middle classes in particular were deeply affected by the deterioration of commerce. While they had struggled in uneven competition with the foreign commercial nexus before 1790, after that date the breakdown of market conditions within Egypt precipitated a very sharp decline in their position. It was also in the 1790's that the foreign commercial nexus began to emerge and to impinge directly on the affairs of state. Greek merchants and others dictated to their Mamlūk lords. They gained lasting commercial advantages from the performance of their services. As early as 1790, the strains of warfare began to show themselves in diverse ways. In cultural fields, patronage sharply declined, a fact which one can deduce from the decline in the number of books which were written in the 1790's as compared to the 1780's. Cultural life, it would seem, became increasingly confined to the minimum required to support religious life. Even the *majlis* al-Wafā'iya seems to have been affected by the decline in the power of the middle class and the waning of the religious revival which it had fostered. What became of the younger generation who had entered the *ṭuruq* in their youth and now, in early manhood, faced the conditions in Egypt during the 1790's? This chapter seeks to provide some answers. It studies in detail the life of Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār, along with his friends ʿAbd al-Rahman al-Jabartī and Ismaʿīl al-Khashshāb. The three together represented the most important continuators of cultural life in Egypt, and while only al-ʿAṭṭār remained active as a teacher with students, all three had a pronounced influence on the culture of the early nineteenth century.

Al-'Aṭṭār's youth fell in a period in which the uneven rhythm of the expansion of the world market had the effect of dismantling the indigenous commercial community, which was also the bearer of the classical cultural heritage. In the space of a scant one hundred years, a middle class arose and was disestablished in Egypt; a bureaucracy was installed and then dismantled in favor of a large landholding class; and, finally, this too was modified and a bureaucracy again was introduced. Throughout this state of flux, so unlike the almost organic unfolding of western European history, the Egyptian intellectuals "maintained" and "adapted" their intellectual traditions. Many similar cases could be drawn from Africa, Latin America, and Asia. How was continuity maintained under these conditions? What is the meaning of the term "cultural continuity" in this context? I shall try to explore this question as far as possible through a discussion of the life of Hasan al-'Aṭṭār.

Al-'Aṭṭār emerged during a period in which the institutions of patronage which had served the eighteenth-century revival were breaking down with no new ones to take their place. Much of his youth was taken up with an unsuccessful quest for patronage, which was needed for al-'Aṭṭār to continue his education. During this period, he was obviously striving to achieve and to be accepted. Given the historical situation, failure was bound to be the outcome. The alternatives for his generation, in fact, were either struggle or passive surrender to an unfavorable situation. The life of 'Abd al-Rahman al-Jabartī contained moments of both alternatives. Al-Khashshāb's represented more the motif of surrender. For al-'Aṭṭār, the failure to succeed led to dissatisfaction with the existing intellectual life, then increasingly to rebellion against it. A certain bitterness was inevitable for all three men. The principal focus in this chapter will be on the attitude represented by al-'Aṭṭār. I shall explore the nature and the degree of rebellion which he expressed and attempt to explain its main outlines in terms of the history of this period.

Biographical Summary

It is necessary to give a chronological account of the main events in the life of Hasan al-'Aṭṭār, then a more detailed account of the events of his youth, before proceeding with an analysis. Al-Khashshāb and al-Jabartī will necessarily occupy our attention as well, but their lives and writings have already been discussed in Chapters 2 and 3.

Chronology of the Life of Hasan al-'Aṭṭār

- 1766 approximate date of birth (in Cairo)
- 1786 first composition in grammar
- 1798 flight to Asyut
- 1799 return to Cairo; writing of the *Maqāma*
- 1802 departure from Egypt by way of Damietta for Turkey

- 1804 first composition on medicine (in Istanbul)
- 1807 visit to Alexandretta
- 1810 trip to Damascus; mystical studies
- 1811 trip to Palestine
- 1814 completion of main works on medicine, essays on *kalām*, glosses on *adab al-baḥth* (argumentation) in Damascus
- 1815 return to Cairo as teacher and writer
- 1820-25 composition of works in logic; royal tutor
- 1828 Arabic editor of the Egyptian Official Gazette (*Al-Waqaʿiʿ al-miṣriya*); beginning of major work in *uṣūl al-dīn*
- 1831 appointed Shaykh al-Azhar; completion of the work in *uṣūl al-dīn*
- 1835 death

The information available on al-ʿAṭṭār's family is unfortunately very limited. According to ʿAlī Mubārak, who relied for his information on al-ʿAṭṭār's son Asad, Asad's grandfather was named Muḥammad and was called Muḥammad Kutn, taking the name of al-ʿAṭṭār as a *nisba*, or attribution, of occupation.¹ Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār signed his works Ḥasan b. Muḥammad al-Shahrī bi'l-ʿAṭṭār, suggesting that this addition was of recent vintage. Perhaps it dated from the time when his father became a druggist. It is also indicated that al-ʿAṭṭār's father came to Egypt from the Maghrib. Little other reliable information can be found on his origins. Concerning his early education, ʿAlī Mubārak presented al-ʿAṭṭār as having had friends who attended al-Azhar while he himself had to work at his father's trade. He memorized the Qurʾān to "qualify" to enter the mosque university and thereby persuaded his father to permit him to carry on with his studies. This picture of his father as an uneducated man who discouraged his son's efforts to obtain an education is belied to some extent by the indication that, when al-ʿAṭṭār did memorize the Qurʾān, it was regarded as a triumph and celebrated as a milestone by both father and son. It opened doors to him, but at the same time it created expectations which were increasingly unrealizable in the particular period in which he lived.

From the earliest records available, al-ʿAṭṭār is pictured as intellectually gifted. He memorized the Qurʾān without assistance while he was working for his father; when he was young, he sought opportunities to go to al-Azhar informally with some of his friends; when he entered al-Azhar, he completed the elementary syllabus very rapidly but then sought to pursue other subjects rather than seek immediate employment as a lower religious functionary. In this we see him breaking with the milieu of the artisan community. It would not have been at all difficult for him to have secured a lower post. It was the fact that he sought a higher education and thus higher social status which makes clear the problems created by the social context of his day.

The problem of patronage was clearly on his mind even during his teens. It was roughly on his twentieth birthday, in 1786, that he wrote a short

grammatical work in rhymed prose for an unnamed Turkish patron, perhaps a member of the Ottoman forces invading Egypt.² In any case nothing came of it.

The first person known to have been a friend of al-ʿAṭṭār was a singer who was also noted as a prominent writer and grammarian. In the year 1787–88/1202, al-Jabartī mentions that Khalīl Efendī al-Baghdādī was unmarried and visited his friend Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār to get his clothes washed. Al-Baghdādī had come originally from a prominent Iraqi family and knew many of the *beys* of Egypt (e.g., ʿAbd al-Raḥman Bey). He was especially close to Murād Bey, who studied handwriting with him. Al-Baghdādī's reputation in Egypt stretched over some forty years, from the year 1730/1145, when his poem on the death of the Wazīr al-Makrūm ʿAbdullah Pasha al-Kiwarlī brought him fame. His life, however, was destined to end in misery with the exile of Murād. Despite his friendship with the *beys*, al-Baghdādī must have been regarded as something of a curiosity in Egyptian society. He must have been one of the few independent figures in Egyptian cultural life, and perhaps for this reason al-ʿAṭṭār was attracted to him.³

Al-ʿAṭṭār's friendship with Ismaʿīl al-Khashshāb and al-Jabartī began around 1790. Al-Jabartī was impressed with al-ʿAṭṭār and commented that he was "a good-looking youth, broadchested, clear-eyed, of North African origin but wearing Egyptian clothes and speaking with an Egyptian accent."⁴ From this comment one gains some insight into al-ʿAṭṭār's efforts to achieve mobility through assimilation into Egyptian society. Formal education in the Arabic language, that is, philological studies, was one vehicle, but in the final analysis it was not enough.

It is not known how al-ʿAṭṭār and al-Khashshāb met, although the most probable place was the *majlis* al-Wafāʾiyya. It is known that in the *takniyya* ceremony, al-ʿAṭṭār was given the name of Abū Saʿādāt, and al-Khashshāb the name Abū'l-Ḥasan. This probably took place in the late 1780's.⁵ Al-Khashshāb's background was similar to al-ʿAṭṭār's. His father was a carpenter and petty shopkeeper in the lumber trade near Bāb al-Zuwayla. He, too, had studied with the prestigious *shaykhs* of the reform movement, perhaps to a greater degree than al-ʿAṭṭār. In the course of his studies with al-Zabīdī, he undertook a small commentary on part of al-Ghazzālī's *Iḥyāʾ ʿulūm al-dīn*, on which al-Zabīdī was himself writing a commentary. Al-Khashshāb was likewise a close friend of Muḥammad Abī Anwār and was with him constantly. After the death of al-Zabīdī, al-Khashshāb no longer advanced in scholarly and Sūfī circles. He began instead to seek employment and worked as a clerk for the Ruznamjā. Al-Khashshāb's situation, especially after 1790, was therefore quite similar to that of al-ʿAṭṭār. Both were frustrated.⁶

Al-Jabartī, the mutual friend of al-ʿAṭṭār and al-Khashshāb, was no less affected by the turn of events around 1790 than they were. With the death of his teacher al-Zabīdī and of al-Murādi shortly thereafter in Damascus, al-Jabartī realized that he was the chief repository of the knowledge of the history of the previous generation. This time also brought to an end the

days of his youth when he had toured the Delta and studied *ḥadīth* with *Ṣūfī shaykhs* in Rosetta and Tanṭā.⁷ Al-Jabartī had grown up among the *beys*, who came to his father for instruction. When he went to al-Azhar as a student, he studied *Ḥanafī fiqh* with 'Abd al-Raḥman al-'Arīshī, *Shaykh al-Riwāq* of the Syrians, an '*alīm*' like his father with close connections to the Ottoman Porte.⁸ With the crumbling of the Ottoman presence in Egypt, the al-Jabartī family found their relations with the *shaykhs* of al-Azhar increasingly strained. Hasan al-Jabartī quarreled with the other *shaykhs* and finally withdrew himself from al-Azhar altogether.⁹

Thus, with the decline of the cultural movement, 'Abd al-Raḥman al-Jabartī went into the state of semiretirement in which he was to pass much of the last thirty years of his life. Always the weight of the past obsessed him; and although, as did al-Khashshāb and al-'Aṭṭār, he sought patronage and new opportunities, his life was different from theirs, being a part of the declining gentry.

In the 1790's, both al-Khashshāb and al-'Aṭṭār apparently sought the patronage of Muḥammad Bey al-Alfī. Al-'Aṭṭār wrote poetry praising the beauty of his new house. Al-Khashshāb was a friend of his. Al-Jabartī, too, preferred him over Muḥammad 'Alī. Little is known about this man. In 1803, when he visited London, British sources describe him as a collector of astronomical instruments and as interested in mysticism.¹⁰

With the coming of the French in 1798, al-'Aṭṭār, al-Khashshāb, and al-Jabartī boldly turned to them in search of the patronage which they had not found elsewhere. Al-Jabartī worked for them and served in the *Dīwān*. In his main chronicle, he revealed a considerable familiarity with their activities. Al-Khashshāb wrote for them a short history of Egypt.¹¹ Al-'Aṭṭār exchanged lessons with them, as will be discussed below. For all three, these efforts were unproductive; in the case of al-'Aṭṭār, they were quite detrimental. Al-Jabartī and al-Khashshāb survived the ensuing embarrassment from their friendly interchange with enemies of the state. Al-'Aṭṭār apparently could not and left Egypt. Of the three, al-Jabartī was in the most secure position. He had performed an important role in society during the 1790's, he was well-off, and he was able to bask in the continuing prestige of his father.¹² When the French left and the Ottoman army arrived, his family connections in Istanbul stood him in good stead. The commanding officer of the Ottoman army, Yūsuf Āghā, turned to him to write a history of the recent troubled times. Al-Jabartī wrote the book which Yūsuf Āghā requested and included in it material by al-'Aṭṭār, perhaps as a way of rehabilitating his friend.¹³

Intellectual and moral conflicts have been mentioned in the preceding discussion of merchants and *Ṣūfis*, but I have not concentrated on the psychological problems. Before proceeding with a discussion of al-'Aṭṭār's writings, it might be well to note that, at the end of the European middle ages, a period in Western history which is perhaps analogous in certain ways to eighteenth-century Egypt, the transformation which led to the emergence

of an economy based on commerce and the cultural changes which resulted from this transformation caused exceedingly severe feelings of dislocation.¹⁴ Both societies saw a great flourishing of mystical centers, institutions partly for the care of those who were mentally or morally deranged. 'Abdullah al-Sharqāwī, one of al-'Aṭṭār's teachers, had had a mental breakdown during his youth and had been treated and cured in a *tekke*. The period of al-'Aṭṭār's youth followed the peak period of mystical culture, but preceded that of the switch to rationalist theology.

If one were to pursue a "psychological" analysis of al-'Aṭṭār's youth, the theory must be modified to fit the historical era. The ego psychology of the modern West is written in terms of the relationships within the modern nuclear family. In a situation in which father-mother-child relationships are mediated by the extended family, the possibility of total rebellion and individuation is much less likely to be realized. Even if these processes were to occur, they would not necessarily occur at the same pace as in modern times, for the whole concept of the child, the adolescent, and the process of "growing up" was alien to the medieval world. The child went to work at an early age and was soon regarded as a young adult. If al-'Aṭṭār "rebelled" against his father, it was surely not against his father as an individual but against certain values associated with his father's occupation and social class. It was a forceful rebellion, but at the same time it was an ambivalent one. In rejecting his status and seeking upward mobility, al-'Aṭṭār ultimately abandoned the Maghribī community, and finally left Egypt altogether. At the same time, he was greatly drawn to the popular Andalusian culture of his own social group. He missed its warmth and spontaneity when, in later years, he had risen to the status of a high official.

One could argue that the phases of psychological development were themselves conditioned by the nature of the times. The need to rebel and to seek upward mobility in order to enjoy an intellectual life was characteristic of a society which was developing rigid class barriers. A generation earlier, the pursuit of intellectual life, even physical medicine, the field which drew al-'Aṭṭār, would not necessarily have depended on the prior acquisition of a high socioeconomic status. The need to rebel was also conditioned by homosexuality, which made al-'Aṭṭār's chances in the less liberal environment of the 1790's distinctly poor.

The breakdown of the indigenous economy in the 1790's limited social mobility by sharply limiting the accessibility of patronage. A number of the leading figures of the reform movement died during the period between 1789 and 1791, and those who replaced them were no longer motivated to pursue scholarship to the same degree, if one can judge from the decline in the writing of books. At the same time, increasing numbers of Europeans were coming to Egypt, many in technical capacities which were clearly transforming society. Yet in the face of this challenge, the older generation of *shaykhs* remained rather passive and continued to live from their trade, their landed wealth, and whatever gifts they received. In retrospect, it is difficult to see what alternatives existed for the indigenous merchants' com-

munity, but from the perspective of Hasan al-'Aṭṭār in the 1790's, it is not unlikely that he blamed his teachers for his difficulties. At least, it is not difficult to find examples of his rejection of their views. They in turn did little to help him and thereby created in al-'Aṭṭār a personal basis for criticism and rejection of the dominant *ḥadīth* movement. This was fed by the general ethos of the expanding commercial sector which promoted a growing orientation one might call "scientific" in every sphere of life, including culture. Thus, it would seem reasonable to interpret al-'Aṭṭār's own desire for (as well as his own conception of) intellectual development in terms of the study of the rational sciences as a desire promoted by forces within his own life—in his background and scholarly associations—as well as by the emerging social reality of a dominant capitalist sector.

Al-'Aṭṭār's education in al-Azhar centered on the philological sciences, and his first writings were mainly in these fields. His principal teachers in philology were Muḥammad al-Ṣabbān and Muḥammad al-Amīr. Both had been among the leading figures of the reform movement: one was a symbol of the *ḥadīth* movement in Egypt, the other was the representative of "higher" Maghribī culture in Cairo in his day. Al-'Aṭṭār's decision to study the rational sciences and to abandon the Maghribī community and try to assimilate into Cairene society should be seen through the eyes of these two men. How noticeable it must have been to al-Amīr, who outlived al-Ṣabbān by many years, that al-'Aṭṭār had modified his dress and his accent in order to assimilate into Cairene society.¹⁵ In al-Ṣabbān's last years, al-'Aṭṭār was beginning to read texts in logic. After al-Ṣabbān's death, al-'Aṭṭār turned to Muḥammad al-Disūqī, a scholar of logic. This relationship was, however, short-lived, as al-Disūqī died soon thereafter.

In 1786 al-'Aṭṭār, barely twenty years old, wrote his "*Manzūma fī 'ilm al-naḥw*" in two days, as he rather boastfully claimed. It was written for a patron and in the accepted manner (rhymed prose, religious justifications, etc.). It is from this time that one is alerted to the problems which al-'Aṭṭār confronted. Eight years later, in 1794, al-'Aṭṭār had finished the draft of his first scholarly book, a work indebted to al-Amīr.¹⁶

Al-'Aṭṭār's independence from his teachers (in this case, from al-Ṣabbān) was first clearly asserted in a work in rhetoric which was written in 1797–98/1212.¹⁷ In this work, he broke with some of the literary conventions of his day. Instead of beginning with the traditional ritual praise of the religious virtues of studying the field, al-'Aṭṭār inserted a history of the development of the discipline. Al-'Aṭṭār began with a didactic couplet of his own composition, listing the components of the *'ilm al-bayān* part of rhetoric. He then proceeded to describe the field as it finally culminated in the writings of 'Abd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī.¹⁸ Al-'Aṭṭār then gave an account of one of al-Jurjānī's most important predecessors, Abū 'Ubayda, and cited as his source "the historians." He suggested that the term *al-balagha*, which indicated the general field of rhetoric, dated from a later period (when the discipline was differently organized), citing such works as the gloss of al-Suyūṭī on al-Baydāwī. These later writers (after al-Suyūṭī) based their writings on the

ideas of the great writers, copying in imitation of their lively minds. And that is the way it is to our day—this sort of imitation. Knowledge is a shelter to which the dull cannot find their way—it mocks them with a smile.¹⁹

In the late 1790's, al-'Aṭṭār returned to the study of grammar, renewing and intensifying his critique of the later continuators, notably Khālid al-Azhārī.²⁰ Al-Azhārī was perhaps the most influential later figure, apart from the Imām al-Suyūṭī. Al-'Aṭṭār saw al-Azhārī as an uncritical compiler who "mixed" his sources, unaware that some were *uṣūliyyīn* (traditional jurists-prudents), some *muḥaddithīn*, some *ḥukamā'*, and some *mutakallimīn*; and that, being insufficiently aware of these intellectual currents, he made errors in analysis by drawing material on various questions without understanding the consequences of working within one tradition or another.²¹ Al-'Aṭṭār himself attempted to separate and distinguish these different trends, paying particular attention to the logical implications of questions in grammar which al-Azhārī ignored.

Al-'Aṭṭār made similar criticisms in another work on grammar which was written shortly thereafter.²² This manual was intended for more advanced students. Advanced manuals tended to go deeply into the quarrels of the medieval grammarians, making many erudite points during the process, but al-'Aṭṭār resisted this temptation. In one place he actually praised al-Azhārī for limiting the number of punctuation marks, comparing him favorably to the Imām al-Suyūṭī, who in a certain book listed more than thirty.²³

Al-'Aṭṭār's commentary on *Al-Azhariyya* was not only a critique of Khālid al-Azhārī; it was also a critique of al-'Aṭṭār's teacher Muḥammad al-Amīr. Al-Amīr had earlier inspired him to write a commentary in 1794 on a text of Khālid al-Azhārī. But in the work on *Al-Azhariyya* and in the "Risāla . . . 'alā al-ajurrūmiyya," al-'Aṭṭār criticized books which al-Amīr had praised.²⁴ In addition, al-'Aṭṭār, according to his own claims, was teaching the *Azhariyya* in al-Azhar while al-Amīr was there, even before 1798.²⁵

Finally, the neoclassical revival involved not merely a critique of later figures, but also an effort to uncover a wide range of the classical writers, such as the grammarian al-Azdī, who was the inspiration of "the teacher Abū'l-Ḥasan b. Asfūr, the teacher Abī'l-'Abbās b. al-Ḥājī, the teacher Abū Zakariyā b. Dhū'l-Nūn, the teacher Abū Ja'far b. Raqīqa, and other *shaykhs* of grammar. According to what we have learned, none of these *shaykhs* of grammar has let down his reputation. I have collected some thirty students of his in grammar, and every one of them became famous."²⁶ From al-'Aṭṭār's account of the life of al-Azdī and his students, whom he called here "our teachers," it is clear that the neoclassical revival was still gaining momentum, even during a period of relative cultural decline. Figures who were then known only at second and third hand were now freely praised and held up as a model. This is in clear contrast to the early part of the eighteenth-century revival, when only a few texts of great fame were revived. Progress can also be seen in the extent to which al-'Aṭṭār presented a secular image, both in the above account and in his discussion of *balagha* which was quoted previously.

In general, al-'Aṭṭār's critique of philology (be it in the form of praise or blame) was on the level of particulars. Formal logic and utilitarianism entered in, but they did not transform his process of thought. He was not yet *mutakallim*, although he was beginning to read the basic texts in logic.²⁷

Al-'Aṭṭār's study of the rational sciences long preceded his capacity to effectively internalize them. This took place only during the Muḥammad 'Alī period. However, in his early writings, when his own efforts at criticism were closer in structure and content to those of the *ḥadīth* revival than to nineteenth-century *kalām*, he clearly began to reject the preceding generation in the most fundamental sense: its insistence on verification exclusively in terms of the past. The reasons for this derive from particular factors in his life, together with the social changes of the 1790's.

Al-'Aṭṭār's Study of Literature

A study of al-'Aṭṭār's literary formation is perhaps the clearest way to understand the struggles and conflicts in his own life, conflicts which involved ethnicity, class, and status. It is legitimate to say that in his youth he was a product of two literary cultures, both of them Andalusian-Maghribī, each of which denied the aesthetic and linguistic premises of the other. Al-'Aṭṭār grew up in the "low" culture of the coffeehouses and remained a part of it until he left Egypt. At the same time, he had been exposed to the "high" culture of the Maghāriba, probably through the *majlis al-Wafā'īya* but in any case through such teachers as Muḥammad al-Amīr.

During the particular period of al-'Aṭṭār's youth, popular culture was perceived as more and more of a threat by the conservative 'ulamā', given the general social context of upheaval. For al-'Aṭṭār to openly identify with it, therefore, would have been very dangerous to his career as an *ʿālim*. Given the attraction which it held for him, this was an acute problem.

Al-'Aṭṭār's formation in the "high" culture and literature coincided of course with his attendance at al-Azhar, with his study of philology, and, as was noted in the preceding sections, with his efforts to assimilate into middle-class Cairene society. The fact that literature was not officially taught at al-Azhar was not a major problem. More important was the changing situation of the Maghāriba and of their culture in the Cairo of the 1790's. Here a brief review may be useful. In Chapter 1, it was argued that, on the basis of the outbreak of student disorders, the peak of Maghribī power was in the 1770's or even earlier. This was more or less confirmed, as noted in Chapter 3, by the changing composition of the *majālis*, which became more Cairene-Egyptian and less Maghribī during the latter part of the century. By the 1790's, the situation of cultural studies in general and Andalusian culture in particular was on the defensive. Where al-'Aṭṭār's teacher Muḥammad al-Amīr had made fairly extensive use of Andalusian literary works in his philological studies,²⁸ al-'Aṭṭār was criticized even by his friends when he sought to do the same. Al-Khashshāb criticized al-

'Aṭṭār, even though both al-Khashshāb and al-'Aṭṭār studied with Muḥammad al-Amīr. In the 1790's, the Cairene al-Khashshāb rejected the characteristically North African form of the *muwashshahāt*, making plain in so doing that he was criticizing al-'Aṭṭār for adopting it.²⁹ Another figure who took the same position was an important Egyptian Ṣūfī musician, which leads one to assume that this conflict extended beyond the bounds of literature per se.³⁰

The degree of rejection, however, is very difficult to determine. Al-'Aṭṭār and al-Jabartī might write about the people of Egypt, "Ahl Miṣr," but what cultural boundaries this implies are vague. For example, *ghazal*, or love, poetry, which the Maghāribī also favored, apparently did not pose any similar problems for al-'Aṭṭār despite his predilection for Andalusian models. In the absence of al-'Aṭṭār's "Diwān," I shall turn to a work which he edited and for which he wrote a most informative introduction and conclusion. This work was completed in 1814/1229, which makes it necessary for me to take certain liberties with the strict periodization which I have been following. The spirit of the work conforms so perfectly, however, to what one would expect of the literary situation of the 1790's that it seems justified to do so by including it in my discussion of al-'Aṭṭār's youth. The year 1814 still fits quite well into the larger periodization of the life of al-'Aṭṭār, for the main dividing line separating the writings of his youth from the labors of his mature years comes in 1815, at which time or shortly thereafter he entered into the ethos of the new reforming bureaucracy of Muḥammad 'Alī.

The *Diwān* of Ibn Sahl represented something of a mockery of fate, a fate to which al-'Aṭṭār was nonetheless prepared to bow.³¹ It shared this characteristic with the earlier *Maqāma*, which will be discussed shortly. The author of al-'Aṭṭār's text was a Jewish convert to Islam, an Andalusian poet, and a figure whose reputation was always linked to the ambiguity of his religious commitments. It was not wrong to have chosen a figure of Jewish origin, whether a convert or not. Such works had passed unnoticed in the preceding generation.³² But the decision to reintroduce a writer who had made a joke of his conversion at a time of heightened communal tensions was decidedly an ostentatious act.

This is what came to me of the poetry of Ibrāhīm b. Sahl al-Mālikī al-Ashbili al-Andalusī after an intense search. After asking people from many lands, a copy, i.e., of his "Diwān" finally reached me from some part of Africa upon my asking some of their 'ulamā' for it. . . . This copy is in Maghribī script, which makes reading difficult, and there are inaccuracies [*taḥrīf*] in some of the verses. I made this copy and removed what was included in it of the biographical sketch of Ibn Sahl . . . and concentrated on the poetry, writing an explanation in the margin where I felt it necessary to deal with the defects.³³

[Al-'Aṭṭār saved the difficult matter of the author's biography to the end.]

The author was educated under Abū 'Alī al-Shalūbīn and Ibn Dajjāj and others. Islam by its nature includes into itself and does not abominate or discriminate against non-Muslims. Thus the matter was closed. But then some of the Maghāriba asked how he could write such delicate poetry, and he answered that "it was because he wrote poetry like the gentleness of love and the softness of the Jew."³⁴

[The argument proceeds in the dialectical style of the eighteenth-century *ḥadīth* movement.]

And when he drowned, some of his famous contemporaries said, "a pearl has returned to its homeland." And al-Ḥāfiẓ 'Abdullah Muḥammad b. 'Umar b. Rashid al-Fakhri mentioned in his travel book . . . that there was a disagreement among the Muslims over the nature of Ibn Sahl's true convictions in his innermost soul [*bāṭinan*]. There was written the following on the margin of this copy by the Khaṭīb Sīdī Abū 'Abdullah b. Marzūq in which he stipulated that what he understood from our teachers was correct, that he died a Muslim. But in some of the literary books of the Maghāriba [it was related] that there was once gathered a group with Ibn Sahl in a friendly meeting. They asked him, when they had taken their wine, whether he was outwardly and inwardly a Muslim or not. He replied that it was for man what is outwardly apparent and for God what is veiled. . . . Some of them found proof of his Islamicity in his words "I console myself in Moses out of my love for Muḥammad," and others by "I am guided as if God were not there as a model of right guidance to me, and what occurred to me, in my insignificance, was that the law of Moses was suspended by Muḥammad."

And al-Rā'ī said, may God have mercy on him, I heard from our teacher Abī'l-Hasan 'Alī b. Simā'a al-Andalūsī, may God have mercy on him, that there are two things which are not known to be certain: the Islamicity of Ibrāhīm b. Sahl and the repentance of al-Zamakhsharī from writing *ghazal*. It is a matter of two stories. Regarding the first, I believe Ibn Sahl, but regarding the second, I doubt it. . . . and al-Rā'ī also certified that the incomparable Ibn Sahl was joking with Shaykh Abū'l-Qāsim when he irritated him by saying "Is not Moses at once all and part of the truth? And is not a metaphor the whole and the part?"³⁵

[Al-'Aṭṭār attempted to bring the reader to his own conclusion:]

With this proof one can see that the Andalusian Jews were accustomed to writing in Arabic. If Ibrāhīm uttered the above two verses before converting to Islam (and God Almighty knows), Ibn al-Maqqari has said, "His family related to us that he died a Muslim, drowned in the sea. . . ." Abu Hayyan reported on the authority of Qaḍī al Qudā' [Chief Judge] Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Nāsir al-Fath b. 'Alī al-Ansārī al-Ashbīlī [in Grenada] that Ibrāhīm b. Sahl was a Sevillian

poet, originally Jewish, who converted and praised the Prophet of God, may God bless him and peace—and he showed that in his inimitable *qaṣīda*. Abū Ḥayyān said, "I paused over it, for it is one of the most amazing of those created in its type. . . . Before his death, he used to recite his prayers with the Muslims and mix with them."

Al-'Aṭṭār then closed the book with one of the author's most famous *muwashshahāt*.³⁶

Al-'Aṭṭār used the traditional device of saving his best for last—namely, the opinion of a major historian, a contemporary of Ibn Sahl, and a major literary figure of the following generation. This approach partly nullified the effect of the many amusing and ambiguous comments for which Ibn Sahl was known.

More characteristic than the work on Ibn Sahl was a book such as al-'Aṭṭār's gloss on *Al-Samarqandīya*, a work which was previously mentioned in the section on language sciences. From *Al-Samarqandīya*, one infers two other aspects of the literary climate in Egypt in the 1790's. First, the study of classical literature was still severely handicapped by the non-availability of many of the basic texts during this phase of the neoclassical revival. Many works were known only at second hand, through biographical and historical literature. Second, one can see the extent to which literature had reverted to its role as an adjunct to the study and mastery of a sacred language. That such an approach was uncongenial to al-'Aṭṭār scarcely needs repeating. Also, the problem of acquiring the original *diwāns* of poetry, which was mentioned in the case of Ibn Sahl, was a very considerable one. It was obviously one of the limiting factors in the study of classical literature. For example, in presenting illustrative material to explain a major figure, al-'Aṭṭār introduced eight lines of a poet who he said was magnificent in his ability to describe gardens and ponds and who was renowned as well for his prose, but whom, it would seem, al-'Aṭṭār did not know at first hand. For, as he mentioned, he took his material on this poet, Abū Ishāq b. Khafāji al-Andalusī, from the history of al-Maqqarī called *Nafh al-ṭīb*.³⁷ So it was with many other Andalusian figures of whom he had heard. An exception was undoubtedly Abū Ḥayyān, who had also been one of the main sources for his essay on Ibn Sahl. Al-'Aṭṭār stated clearly that he had studied Abū Ḥayyān "from the mouths of my Andalusian *shaykhs*."³⁸ Elsewhere he claimed that he drew much of his material from that author's book "Al-Tashīl" when he was studying the literary figures of Seville.³⁹

Up to now the emphasis has been placed on the retreat from secular culture in the 1790's and on the conflict which this caused for those determined to pursue the work of cultural revival. In concluding this section, I would like to draw attention to the literature during this period. The chief examples are also drawn from the poetry of al-'Aṭṭār, but many similar examples might have been chosen from al-Khashshāb or al-Jabartī. They reflect a reversion to what may be termed "court culture," as evinced by a

renewed emphasis on the decadent *saj'*. If one were a litterateur, it was necessary to write in *saj'* whenever a patron demanded it; the *majlīs* were no longer a counterforce.

Al-Jabartī has recorded several such poems by al-'Aṭṭār, and it is perhaps for this reason that al-'Aṭṭār is unfortunately best known as a poet of this type. In his "official" poems, al-'Aṭṭār, as did other writers of his period, severely limited himself, not only in terms of the use of language, but also to certain themes and images which could be embellished. In 1799/1214 a Maghribī merchant who was a friend of al-'Aṭṭār and al-Jabartī was appointed Shaykh Riwaq al-Maghāriba. Al-'Aṭṭār was on poor terms with his predecessor, who happened to be a blind man. Al-'Aṭṭār's poem celebrating his friend's appointment began "wake up, for the armies of darkness have gone away, and the morning has come up unveiled," and continued in this vein, relying on the images of flowers, pearls, and so on.⁴⁰ A second example of this can be found in the conclusion of the same poem, where al-'Aṭṭār refers to his subject as "*mawḷāna*," our lord or master. As the man was not one of al-'Aṭṭār's teachers, did not write books, was not a Ṣūfī master, and indeed led a most ordinary and unimportant life, merely having accumulated enough money to qualify for this minor tax farm, the term was clearly mere flattery.⁴¹ Al-Jabartī, writing for a court audience at the beginning of the nineteenth century, included many such poems in his history of Egypt and favored them over any other kind.

Earlier in the same year (1798/1214), when the French came to Cairo, they used their artillery in the area of Birkat al-Azbakiya, destroying some of the beautiful homes there, such as the home of Isma'il Kāshif. Al-Jabartī was saddened by this and included at the end of his account a poem on al-Azbakiya by al-'Aṭṭār in rhymed prose. The mood of the poem alone is a clue to the fact that it was not written against the background of these events. Rather, it was written to praise the beauty of the view from the house of one of the Mamlūks, who had solicited the poem. 'Alī Mubārak republished this poem, and it has become the single best-known poem of al-'Aṭṭār. In it he conveyed the effect of the beautiful grass, trees, and pools. Such poems as the one on al-Azbakiya were numerous, and the element of competition which sometimes led the poet to write a poem answering one by another author or trying to outdo another author by elevation reflected the negative side of the patronage system of the period.⁴²

I now turn to the other side of al-'Aṭṭār's literary formation, the result of his immersion in the popular culture of the Maghāriba.

Popular Andalusian Literature and the Youth of al-'Aṭṭār

Maghribī "low culture" was historically the product of an artisanal class. Here one may imagine that restraints on wine imbibing and narcotics were relaxed, while cultural and spiritual activities provided a release from the hard restraints of life. Here music and secular literature, as well as folk

stories, had (and still have) an important role. The culture of the masses was by its nature most free from literary artifice—the most given to warmth, spontaneity, and an unself-conscious appreciation of beauty traits which we find only occasionally in the writings of later *'ulamā'*, heterosexual or homosexual: "Êtes-vous enclin à l'amour? Vous avez là un être svelte, de nationalité Turque, au visage éclatant comme la lune; il semble d'être tout entier composé de perles; il a l'oeuil noir, la joue vermeille et une bouche dont la salive possède la saveur de nectar et la suavité de parfum."⁴³

During his youth, response to beauty, the desire to capture it in words, the writing of poetry, and the study of Andalusian literature were fused in al-'Aṭṭār's personality. It is easy to see from the suggestive images concerning wine and illicit relationships which abound in his writings that al-'Aṭṭār, when not writing the official *saj'* poetry, wrote for the coffee shop, a place where poetry and song, wine and ḥaṣhīsh united people from different walks of life. An encouragement to such indulgence came from the *turuq* themselves. That he frequented this milieu there is no doubt. In the *Inshā'* al-'Aṭṭār, he included a letter to a Ṣūfī *shaykh* in which he wrote of a "perfumed night of wine drinking . . . reminding me of moonlit nights in which the wine glass was merciful until I saw with the eye of a lover. . ."⁴⁴ The same imagery of wine, taken from Andalusian poetry, is included in an example of an *ijāza* which al-'Aṭṭār wrote.⁴⁵

The main literary work of the period in which elements of popular culture find a sustained presentation in a classical literary form was, as I have mentioned, the *Maqāmat al-'Aṭṭār*, which was written in 1798 or 1799. The background of this work in terms of al-'Aṭṭār's literary background has been discussed. I turn now to the activities of al-'Aṭṭār during the composition of the *Maqāma* in an attempt to determine his state of mind when he wrote it. It is clear at the outset that the coming of the French to Cairo had a highly destabilizing effect on the life of the city. This was particularly true of the *'ulamā'*, who found themselves in a very difficult situation. Quite a number, in fact, eventually compromised themselves.

In 1798/1215, with the coming of Napoleon, al-'Aṭṭār and a group of *'ulamā'* fled to Upper Egypt. Al-'Aṭṭār remained in the Ṣa'id for approximately eighteen months, fearing the French army and seeking refuge in an area controlled by Murād Bey.⁴⁶ Al-'Aṭṭār's fright was much greater and his self-imposed isolation much longer than that of the other *'ulamā'*. Al-Jabartī also fled to his village to prevent any breakdown of landlord authority, but his absence from Cairo was much shorter and less unpleasant than that of al-'Aṭṭār.⁴⁷

Napoleon's rapid stabilization of commerce and the land won the cooperation of most of the Egyptian middle classes. After a short period, al-Jabartī received a letter from Shaykh Sulaymān al-Fayyūmī and Muhammad al-Sāwī inviting him to return to Cairo to serve in the Diwān. There then took place a correspondence between al-'Aṭṭār in Asyūt and al-Jabartī in Cairo, selections from which al-Jabartī drew in his writings on this period. From these letters we can deduce that for al-'Aṭṭār this was a period of consider-

able suffering, that he lived in isolation from the events in Cairo except for the occasional letters of his friend, that he sought to come back as quickly as possible but the imposition of the quarantine because of the plague delayed this, and that, finally, when he and some other *shaykhs* did come straggling back they had to overcome en route dangers from the Bedouin.

Returning to Cairo in the middle of 1801/1215, al-'Aṭṭār found a situation in which the normal sanctions of social behavior were relaxed. In some cases, reversals of the norm had had immediate political repercussions, such as the much-discussed persecution of the Muslims during Ramaḍān by some Copts. Al-'Aṭṭār's impression of the Europeans underwent a significant transformation in the context of these new conditions. In 1798 he had written a poem, "The French in Egypt have lost their money between bars and donkeys; soon they will face a disaster in Syria where they will find their end," which reflected the contemptuous attitudes of al-Azhar.⁴⁸ But when al-'Aṭṭār returned, "circumstances were different," permitting respectable people to make contacts with them.

Al-'Aṭṭār swung wildly from extreme to extreme. The painfully maintained identity resolution which had been sustained over the years simply gave way. What appeared when this façade was lifted was more or less genuine. Al-'Aṭṭār turned to composing poetry freely. He sought to understand the new technology and practical arts of Europe, and he sought the social mobility which had been denied him in the 1790's. When, in the wake of his decision not to press too far in his social relations with the French, he wrote down in his autobiographical fragment an explanation of his motivations, he did so in the same free-spirited fashion (see Appendix I). This account incorporates some remarkable statements. The first is al-'Aṭṭār's claim that the French were "peaceful" rather than "cruel," that is, al-'Aṭṭār's ability to see them in human terms; second and more important, historically speaking, was the statement stressing the fact of their love of philosophy and their willingness to discuss it.⁴⁹

Al-'Aṭṭār then presented his account of his first meeting with the French. In this account, the broad outline of al-'Aṭṭār's defense of himself becomes clear. Al-'Aṭṭār was emotionally overwhelmed and did things out of love which he later regretted; intellectually captivated, he overdid his contacts with the French scholars. Having spent a traumatic year and a half in the Ṣa'id, al-'Aṭṭār had suddenly returned to Cairo, finding for the first time the chance for free expression of his emotions in poetry and the unrestrained pursuit of new forms of intellectual life. The forcefulness with which al-'Aṭṭār described these moments of liberation, his degree of self-awareness, and his candidness give this short piece psychological as well as historical significance.

As a form of self defense, or mea culpa, the *Maqāma* would seem to have been a total failure. Al-'Aṭṭār's honesty in defending foreign knowledge, even philosophy, and his frank acknowledgment of having been attracted to Europeans which ended in a criticism of himself rather than the Europeans were in striking contrast to the analogous works of al-Sharjawi and al

Jabartī. The *Maqāma* could also be seen as a defense of the study of literature and the natural sciences, subjects which had been declining in Cairo in the 1790's, subjects which required an openness to foreigners. One can only surmise how negative an effect this work must have had at the end of the French occupation—a period marked by extreme antipathy to Europeans—written by a *shaykh* in al-Azhar.

Al-'Aṭṭār, writing of this period years later (1815) in Damascus to explain to his Syrian students his work on *Al-Azharīya*, was in a very different situation; thirteen years of exile had made him very homesick. "I had been gathering glosses on the commentary of *Al-Azharīya* in the field of grammar when I was teaching it in al-Azhar to some students; then I made my analysis and was about to make the final draft when the disasters which befell Egypt from the French *kāfirs* happened. I left, fleeing Egypt for Turkey, seeking my companionship in this rough draft and some of my other books."⁵⁰ Elsewhere in the same work he states: "I finished the rough draft of this gloss in the end of Dhū'l-Qa'da in the year 1217, and I was at that time in the fort at Damietta on my way out of Egypt to Turkey."⁵¹

In conclusion, we might find many incentives, both negative and positive, to explain why al-'Aṭṭār fled from Egypt at the end of the French occupation. His desire to pursue the rational sciences was a long-term source of frustration to him. The flow of historical events, especially the French occupation, transformed circumstances by relaxing previous taboos and creating certain expectations and caught al-'Aṭṭār by surprise; when the occupation was over, he found himself compromised by it and was forced to flee. His general state of alienation was a factor. Another important reason for leaving Egypt was that there would be few or no stable sources of patronage in the near future. Al-'Aṭṭār left for Turkey, the most developed part of the Ottoman Empire, taking his skills in Arabic philology and seeking knowledge in the natural sciences. The departure of al-'Aṭṭār presaged the end of further cultural development until a new constellation of historical forces reshaped Egyptian society.

Chapter 5

Turkey and Syria in the Early Nineteenth Century: The Travels of al-‘Aṭṭār and the Preparation for Egyptian Reform

This chapter continues the analysis through the reform period from 1815 to 1837 and the culture which it produced. During this period, the modern Egyptian state was formed. Several studies of the period have stressed the important role of western Europeans in the process of state formation in Egypt. In this study the role of Egyptians is central, that of the Ottoman reform movement is secondary, and that of Europeans is only tertiary.

This chapter begins with an analysis of the socioeconomic structure of Turkey shortly after the reform period of Selim III, followed by a similar analysis of Egypt in 1815. This analysis explains why the development of Egypt, a breakaway province of the Ottoman Empire, was actually aided by experienced Turkish personnel, both through their actual defection from the Ottoman Empire and through their contribution to the education of Egyptians who played an important role in the new state structure. The ruling elite in both Istanbul and Cairo during this period of the early nineteenth century shared a common theological-juridical orientation, and there was some similarity in intellectual trends in both cities.

The principal development in theology during this period was the revival of *kalām* by members of the ruling elite. This was especially noticeable in Egypt. There was at the same time a sharp decline in the use of *ḥadīth*, and in fact the *mutakallimūn* explicitly criticized the use of *ḥadīth*, after a generation in which *ḥadīth* studies had been the overwhelming preoccupation of the dominant class. This trend is of great interest to this study, for it is a phenomenon which may be interpreted on several levels. First, it was a reflection of social conflict. Middle-class Egyptian merchants and artisans now struggled to survive in a regime dominated by Turks, Europeans, and a few Egyptian *mutakallimīn*. This suppressed middle class continued to engage in *ḥadīth* studies, as is evident from the writings of the majority of the Azharī *shaykhs* of the period. Second, it was a reflection from within the structure of elite religious thought of the growth of utilitarian rationalism. This tendency opposed the Ash‘arite tendencies of the seventeenth-century *muhaddithīn*. Finally, the criticism of the arguments of the *muhaddithīn* sustained and reinforced an interest in history, philology, and literature, as well as logic, science, medicine, and related fields which attracted the ‘*ulamā*’ who participated in the reform movement. The main line of development in these fields is a search of the Islamic past for a range

of models appropriate to the conditions of the early nineteenth century. The rationalist foundations for *kalām* came primarily from India.

The legal-juridical framework thus juxtaposed and combined two incongruous elements which have escaped scholarly attention in the past. On the one hand, the revival of Islamic rationalism meant a revival of the Aristotelian framework. Yet this revival was partial and selective. The principal feature of Aristotelian logic which concerned Hasan al-'Aṭṭār, the chief *mutakallim* in Egypt, was argument by analogy. Argument by analogy and discussions explicating the nature of analogy and how it should be applied demonstrated that it, too, could serve as a vehicle for utilitarianism for reform-minded intellectuals. This is important, for theories of modernity frequently stress the apparent wholesale rejection of the indigenous past. Neoclassicism, which was at the base of the cultural revival of the eighteenth century, continued in the nineteenth century, expanding into areas of Egyptian thought in which it had not previously been significant. Finally, different fields proceeded at different rates of development under the general influence of neoclassicism.

This raises the question of why neoclassicism played such an important role in the development of Egyptian culture during this period. The simplest answer is that neoclassicism as a conscious elite endeavor was, both in the eighteenth and in the nineteenth centuries, an efficient vehicle of cultural domination. Indigenous traditions supporting reform were often more persuasive and inspired less conflict and confrontation than did European traditions. Neoclassicism was not the only option, as we can see through a comparison between Egyptian and Ottoman culture. The Ottomans maintained a high level of awareness of developments in European technology and medicine, and until the eighteenth century they found no great difficulty integrating these developments into the rationalist framework of late medieval thought. (This may sound odd, but as Hossein Nasr has observed, Ibn Sīnā, the symbol of medieval medical thought, was also taught in German medical schools into the beginning of the nineteenth century.) A historian of Turkish literature in the nineteenth century has even observed that the transition from Ottoman literature in the early nineteenth century to European-dominated styles did not mark a radical break in the expression of the concrete, an interesting statement which attests to the vitality of a supposedly "decadent" period.¹ Again, the simplest answer to the question of why classicism was not continued in Egypt may be that the opponents of the reform movement had taken it over, and they had become a formidable force.

The cultural elite of the reform period was composed almost entirely of Egyptians. But Egyptians were at that time denied access to the dominant military and political elite which was initially monopolized by Turks. Neoclassicism asserted the value of Arabic high culture over against Turkish. It also served to retain Islamic culture in a court increasingly dominated by European influence. The development of the Arabic language to meet the

new challenges of the age, as well as the assertion of Islamic tradition, strengthened the Egyptian position within the ruling class. Neoclassicism was a means of self-assertion and, ultimately, one of the foundations of nationalism.

During the reform period, neoclassicism advanced in different fields at different rates. In some areas there were vast outpourings, in others repression. In the age of the printing press, significant works remained in manuscript form, although they were written by such a prominent figure as Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār. Why was this so? Perhaps because there was no place in Cairo for such a work as al-ʿAṭṭār's in the field of physical medicine (a book he wrote in Damascus). It could not be introduced in al-Azhar, and there was no alternative in Egypt to Western medicine, which had been in use since the eighteenth century. As a result, a work of potentially great interest to modern scholarship remained a manuscript. In his work, al-ʿAṭṭār shows that the tradition of Ibn al-Nafīs, a medieval writer who is said to have anticipated Harvey in the theory of the circulation of the blood, did not die out in the later Islamic world. He also shows that there were Muslims who apparently supported a rebuttal of the central ideas of Ibn Sina against the majority. This important general discovery for the structure of the history of medicine is important in clarifying the role of neoclassicism in Egypt.

This chapter further examines the intellectual formation of Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār, who played a central role in cultural reform in Muḥammad ʿAlī's Egypt. In the process, it examines intellectual life in Turkey and Syria, to explain not only al-ʿAṭṭār's development but also the development of those Arabs and Turks who flocked to Egypt to participate in what was in effect a breakaway reform movement. Finally, it seeks to clarify the relationships among Turkey, Syria, and Egypt in this period. I shall explore the relationship between the Ottoman heartland and its provinces in the light of the development of the world market and its progressive impact on Turkey.

Turkey had the earliest and most sustained relationship with the capitalist West of any of the Middle Eastern countries. But Turkey was protected from the full impact of capitalism because it was the seat of an empire based on tributary relationships. This allowed capitalism to develop in Turkey over a long period of time without the radical institutional transformations which occurred in Egypt. Modern historiography of the Ottoman Empire has emphasized this continuity to such an extent that the decisive change from one precapitalist phase to another is still unclear. For the purposes of this study, Istanbul in the late eighteenth century represented the Ottoman Empire's state commercial sector. Landowning bureaucrats used precapitalist means of coercion, including state power, to produce crops for sale on the world market. This landlord bureaucratic class openly allied itself with the commercial minorities. The latter conducted marketing operations for them and performed other services. It is often assumed that the commercial state sector was less evolved in the Ottoman Empire of the early nineteenth century than the analogous formation in Egypt during the

period 1815–1837. In the time before the Tanzimat reform period, the Ottoman *a'yān* (provincial notables) were able, through alliance with disaffected elements in the city of Istanbul, to overthrow sultans and to block technicalization, institutional reform, and other measures which would have contributed to the development of a capitalist mode of production. In Egypt, there was greater centralization, and political opposition was less organized, as we shall show in Chapter 6.

Turkey's integration into the world market encouraged the cultivation of a reformist Maturīdite theology among the leading '*ulamā*' of Istanbul. The existence of regional centers of power in Turkey, along the caravan routes, created the political context for a theological (and in effect a juridical) opposition. This opposition differed from that of the popular orders in Istanbul. Its orientation was not toward heterodoxy but toward orthopraxy. The movement called the *Ṭarīqa Muḥammadiya*, which exaggerated the performance of ritual, made its last stand in these years. With the Tanzimat reform period, these regional centers no longer could challenge Istanbul. Hasan al-ʿAṭṭār was among those *fuqahā* who began their careers in speculative theology with a polemic against the revival of this movement.

In the early nineteenth century, Damascus was a precapitalist commercial center which differed from Istanbul and Cairo in being wholly based on trade, with a very limited agricultural hinterland. Damascus was more organically commercial. Its ideological orientation and culture were less eclectic than those of Istanbul and Cairo. Damascus symbolized Muslim commercial power and sheltered a highly developed form of mystical life. It was both a center of mystical learning and a source of recruitment for many leading Ottoman personnel. It had been important for the Egyptians in the eighteenth century at the time of their merchant commercial revival, when Muṣṭafā al-Bakrī came from Damascus to Cairo to develop the Khalwatiya-Bakrīya reform movement which was discussed in the first chapter.

The early years of the nineteenth century marked the end of an era for Damascus, too. Three factors began to undermine Damascus' commercial position: the disruption of trade routes caused by the prolonged Wahhābī wars, British commercial penetration of India which undermined the Indian end of the Indian-Syrian luxury trade, and, finally, the development of the French commercial position in the Levant, which was discussed in Chapter 1. By the 1820's a defensive orthopraxist movement found a home in Damascus with the rise of Shaykh Khalīd.

Al-ʿAṭṭār's studies in Damascus from 1810 to 1815 highlight the crises in mystical theology confronting reformist theology in Istanbul and Cairo. In Istanbul, Maturīdism was becoming an intellectually fragmented body of thought, susceptible to the influence of positivism. In traveling from Khalwati reformist circles in Istanbul to the more-inward-turning mystical circles of the Khalwatiya in Damascus, al-ʿAṭṭār discovered the conflicts which divided the people of his age as they were reflected in different tendencies in the confraternity in which he had grown up.

Holistic and integrative thought flourished in the precapitalist commer-

cial sectors. This had made such towns as Damascus into important intellectual centers. With the development of modern capitalism through the world market, not only were the traditional commercial centers displaced, but also the new Muslim capitalist elite, like the landowning bureaucracy of Turkey and Egypt after 1837, abandoned this mode of thought. For these latter, the urge toward a synthetic understanding was replaced by a drive toward unitary accumulation of parts of a whole which they could not comprehend, over against which they felt powerless. Some of the most important intellectual struggles which took place in Turkey in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, struggles which the Syrians entered in a highly partisan fashion, centered around the acceptability of the Wujūdī position. The Wujūdī position was a holistic synthesis, more or less pantheistic, of man and nature. The forces which opposed the development of agricultural capitalism in Turkey championed it. The reform movement destroyed certain Šūfī movements in Istanbul which had championed the Wujūdī position. In so doing, it displayed the class dynamics which underlay apparently abstruse points about the nature of man and God. A movement which espoused a rather less pantheistic version of the same doctrine existed in Damascus, where it continued well into the nineteenth century.

The bourgeois class which triumphed in Turkey and Egypt during the nineteenth century did so during periods of rapid reform which seemed to rise and fall with an individual ruler. These periods of reform were moments of effective alliance between Western technocrats and the indigenous political elite, which succeeded in weakening the indigenous opposition. Reform in the nineteenth century did involve extensive institutional change. This affected the development of culture very directly, for patronage was virtually controlled by a few bureaucrats. Of equal consequence for the development of culture, the rise of the central state power coincided with a decline in *ḥadīth* as the official juridical expression of the state 'ulamā'. *Ḥadīth* was replaced by *fiqh*. This did not, of course, mean a cessation of either the obligatory religious or intellectual activities that characterized the first phase but rather that these activities were placed in a new context.

Some of the reasons for these changes are self-evident. In the case of Egypt, the commercial sector gained political control of the state, and in so doing took over responsibility for law giving and, hence, required the participation of *fuqahā'*. It is interesting to note that the dominant class abandoned *ḥadīth* studies, the arena of intellectual conflict of the previous era, and left it to the suppressed middle class. The ruling class relied on *kalām*, at least during the period of "reform." This phase, when class cleavage was sharpest and polemics most bitter, was the heyday of the state commercial sector. *Ḥadīth* studies had been most congruent with merchant capitalism; *kalām* was most congruent with state domination. One might also note that the merchant class abandoned the Māturidite theology to the new dominant class, although in the period of its own ascendancy it had initiated the introduction of Maturidite theology against Ash'arite theology.

Māturīdite *kalām*, fully developed, provided the appropriate religious climate for the reform movement of this period. Māturīdite *kalām* was an effective weapon in the hands of the regime's spokesmen. In this regard, the state commercial sector differed from the agrarian capitalism which arose after 1837, which for totally different reasons reverted again to *ḥadīth* studies. A well-known example of these changes from Egypt may be found in the life of Rifā'a al-Taḥṭāwī. He was the son of a merchant from the Delta who was displaced by the rise of Muḥammad 'Alī. In his youth he studied *ḥadīth*, but when he became a member of the new reform bureaucracy, he became a *mutakallim*, as is evinced by his essay on *ijtihād*, reliance on self-judgment in theological matters. Later, following the development of agrarian capitalism in the third phase (after 1837), he produced his major religious work, and it was a study of *ḥadīth*.

A reliance on Māturīdite *kalām* imposed the need for the study of certain ancillary disciplines, such as logic and rhetoric, and these fields were revived; in addition, a new relevance was found for the study of the traditional Aristotelian corpus during that period. Certain topics in logic or geometry recur many times; among these were discussions of argument by analogy. The explanation for this was a social one, a reflection of the contradiction between the mode of production and the mode of distribution. We are accustomed to conceiving of all modern cultural history in terms of the center of the world market. Not only does such a conception exclude indigenous non-Western traditions, but it also gives an unbalanced perspective by which to judge the development of Western culture outside the West. If, however, we shift our focus to the problems of adaptation, adjustment, and implementation in precapitalist regions which fell under Western influence, having struggled unsuccessfully to control the industrial revolution, we can see why the framework of empiricism which was central to Western thought at the beginning of the industrial era was confronted by a framework which now grew to place great stress on deductive reasoning and argument by analogy.

Al-'Aṭṭār's period of study in Turkey and Syria represented a time of preparation for the tasks he undertook on his return to Egypt in 1815. While Turkey was in a period of regressing away from "reform," a number of individuals and institutions, including libraries, existed which made the study of the rational sciences possible. While we do not know how, it is clear from his writings that he finally secured the patronage he had long sought and never found in Egypt. References to his associates in Turkey include a number of highly placed figures. In both Turkey and, later, Syria, he is identified with Khalwatī circles, and they certainly represented in terms of outlook and range of interests something fairly close to what al-'Aṭṭār himself did. The numerous interconnections between Syria and Istanbul and the paucity of biographical sources make it difficult to determine his motives for going to Damascus in 1810. What is fairly clear is the nature of the work he undertook there and, to a certain extent, its relationship to his earlier studies in Turkey. I would like to speculate: One motivation may have arisen from

his studies in Turkey in the natural sciences. In reading the later commentaries and the achievements of different ages, he did not find himself drawn to the classical period, although he obviously had read widely, noting, for example, the importance of the translation movement in Dār al-Ḥikma. What held his attention was the work in the astronomical observatories of Samarqand and Marāgha. This work, which was carried out by such figures as Nāṣir al-dīn al-Ṭūsī, was largely accomplished under the aegis of a Shī'ī ethos. The intensified communal feeling made it difficult in all probability to use such sources for teaching purposes without some theological justifications. Al-'Aṭṭār, in fact, made recourse to a rather strange justification for his reliance on al-Ṭūsī. In any case, it was in Damascus that al-'Aṭṭār turned to reading Ibn al-'Arabī with a specialist, and it is at this point that his own views on Ṣūfism crystallized, insofar as we can use this expression; for he retained all his life an ambivalence toward mystical experience, which he found essentially alien to his soul. A second reason may have come from his studies of logic and *kalām*, which began in Turkey. Again, his interests were focused on the postclassical commentators, whose merits he freely discussed. The majority of these commentators were Indian. Al-'Aṭṭār praised the virtues of the Indian rational tradition several times and compared it to the feeble condition of rational studies in al-Azhar. Nearly all these commentators were Ṣūfis, most of them Naqshbandis. In coming to Damascus, al-'Aṭṭār would find the center of the Indian Naqshbandī-based Māturīdism in the Arab world. A third reason might simply be that he returned with a Syrian who was his friend and colleague in Istanbul and found Damascus a very congenial place. For the last time he was free to study Andalusian poetry. He even composed some poetry of his own; but unfortunately, while he was there, he lost the only copy of his "Dīwān."

Istanbul

Istanbul represented the most advanced center of capitalist development in the Middle East prior to the Muḥammad 'Alī period. The conflict between urban and rural interests in the Ottoman Empire had been developing for more than a century. Local notables struggled against higher bureaucrats in Istanbul, each seeking to control the wealth which accrued from trade. Throughout this period, the balance of power seesawed back and forth as different regimes rose and fell. Muḥammad 'Alī's regime (1805–1848) was a case of more absolute dominion in the Middle East, for he was actually able to uproot the peasantry. In Turkey, periods of domination were relative. When the higher bureaucrats and the Sultan held the upper hand, there were periods of "reform"; foreigners were given commercial privileges vis-à-vis indigenous merchants and foreign experts were brought in to create a new army which would support the government in its policy of attempting to gain monopolistic control of the wealth from commerce. During periods of dominance by the local notables, the Janissaries and the

popular Şüfî orders, such as the Bektashis, thrived and the urban structure reverted away from class relations.

The commercial sector of Istanbul in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries was more dependent on Europe than that of Cairo during the same period. The expansion of European trade after the Renaissance had made a deep impact on Turkey far earlier than it had on Egypt. Strains on the indigenous artisanal community were noticeable from the seventeenth century, when the rising demand for raw silk in France and other more advanced countries caused them to turn to Turkey. The government export of raw silk proved to be a very great hardship for the Turkish silk industry. Artisans in this basic industry of medieval Turkey found themselves both with a shortage of raw silk and forced to compete with silk products which undersold their own. The Ottoman government was unable or disinclined to control its own standards of production; nonguild merchandise, illegally produced and generally of inferior quality, proliferated in the seventeenth century. In the early eighteenth century, the Turks imported artisans to improve the quality of production from the Morea, but nothing stemmed the export of raw silk. In the later eighteenth century, Turkey was forced to make a series of economic concessions which undermined her economic independence. Until 1777 it had been forbidden for foreigners who became naturalized citizens to pass their merchandise directly to French citizens representing the Marseilles firms in Turkey. In 1777 this ban was lifted.² This greatly strengthened the foreign commercial sector and its indigenous tributaries at the expense of local trade interests. In 1806, the Turkish government attempted to impose a quota for the export of raw silk from Bursa, but by then it was too late to salvage the position of the artisans. In 1818 came the Anglo-Ottoman Treaty of Commerce which further limited the tax on imports while keeping the tax on exports at a high level.³ The ruin of the indigenous urban economy was impassively described in the celebrated travel account of M. A. Ubicini. He chronicled the decline in the number of looms in Anatolia, Syria, and Iraq between the late eighteenth century and the 1840's. Similar declines were noted across the board in other artisanal wares.⁴

Simultaneous with the undermining of the artisanal economy (which proceeded throughout the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries), corresponding changes took place on the higher levels of the bureaucracy. These changes reflected the new wealth and power which accrued to these officials. Class relations emerged; corporativism was replaced by economic individualism. If the '*ulamâ*' had represented a unity until the middle of the eighteenth century, this rapidly gave way during the next half century to patron-client relations, as a great gulf emerged between a few wealthy religious bureaucratic officials (*mollas*) and the rest of the Turkish '*ulamâ*'. The Sultan intervened with a number of firmans ordering the Qāḍî to uphold the Shari'a and to desist from the sale of legal decisions to the highest bidder.⁵

The last years of the eighteenth century, during the reign of Selim III,

witnessed another abortive reform period in Turkey. Characteristically, the gap between the rich and poor widened, and it was in this period that such popular institutions as the Janissaries and the Bektashis were "discredited." Selim was overthrown in 1807 by a coalition of popular forces, including Janissaries but also a sizable number of '*ulamā*'. Reasons given for the revolt of 1807 explicitly include the distress of the people under the weight of rising prices as well as revolts in other parts of the Empire.⁶ An examination of the policies of Selim can be found in a book inspired by one of his leading religious spokesmen, the Mufti Durri Zadeh. In this work, a much-praised collection of *fatāwī*, the preoccupation of the regime with the interests of the landlord and foreign merchants is massively evident. Commerce remained virtually unregulated; it was the age of *laissez faire*.⁷

When the "reform" movement of the landowning class was resumed in the 1820's, the trends of the late eighteenth century resurfaced. The Janissary corps was destroyed in 1826, opening the way for the orthodox *ṭuruq*, whose members were prominent in the ruling class, to expropriate the wealth of the Bektashis and put a number of the latter to death. One writer estimated that the destruction of the Janissaries was followed by the killing of some seventy thousand Bektashis, the destruction of a large number of *tekkes*, and the turning over of a great deal of Bektashi wealth to representatives of the elite *Ṣūfī* orders, the Naqshbandis and the Khalwatīs. Only in the 1850's did a more conservative Bektashi organization begin to revive.⁸

The shift in balance of power was already reflected in the Anglo-Ottoman Treaty of 1818-1820. The indigenous merchants and artisans had been seriously weakened by the unequal competition with European industry; the Janissaries, too, had been weakened in wars against Russia. Seventy thousand craftsmen were expendable, and the regime was so strong that whatever protests ensued could be ignored. The year 1826, which witnessed the destruction of the Janissaries and the massacre of the Bektashis, rightly marks a turning point; never again, except briefly after World War I, was the balance of forces in Turkey ever in doubt.

Before turning to a study of cultural institutions and leading intellectuals at the time of al-ʿAṭṭār's studies in Turkey, I shall proceed with a socio-economic analysis of a formation characterized by a proportionately larger commercial sector than Istanbul or Cairo, a more limited agrarian hinterland, and an enduring sense of corporate identity, far stronger than that of either Cairo or Istanbul. This was the city of Damascus.

Damascus

The factors which have previously been mentioned conspired to undermine the commercial position of Damascus, but they did so in a fashion which prolonged the existence of a medieval sense of corporate identity. The reason for this is that the threats (the Wahhābī wars, British commercial activity in India, and growth of French commerce in the Levant) were external.

and the resistance which was made was against common foes. The livelihood of the artisans, as well as that of the merchants, was jeopardized by these developments.

In the eighteenth century, the French presence in Syria was noticeable only in Aleppo, where a community of European merchants lived in relative isolation.⁹ Much of their work was performed for them by the *beratli* community of Syrian Christians, mentioned in Chapter 1. For their labors the Syrian Christians were rewarded by guarantees of protection which they received through the capitulations agreements. From the middle of the eighteenth century, the Syrian Christians rose in importance; in fact, they dominated the important littoral trade between Syria and Egypt.¹⁰ As they did so, the Syrian Muslims relinquished their hold. Muslims in the late eighteenth century dominated the *wikālat*, or wholesale trade houses, of Ṭufāḥ, Junīya, and Ḥamzāwī, but the most famous merchant names of the period, such as Faraʿūn and Hanna Fākhīr, were Christian.¹¹

I now turn to a second area of confrontation, the Wahhābī campaign. Among the chief events of the late eighteenth century was the rise of the Wahhābīs as a threat to Syrian commerce. The Arabian Wahhābīs actually raided in Syria in 1793. In that year they succeeded in overrunning the bordertowns of Ṣūb, Dūmat, and al-Jundal. In 1797/1212, Ḥajīlān b. Ḥāmid, the Amīr al-Qaṣīm, raided the Wādī al-Sharārāt, taking much of its wealth. This had the effect of convincing a number of the Bedouins of Syria to come to his side. Despite the absolute silence of Damascene sources, there was, in the death notice of a writer who died in 1803/1218, a passing reference to the departure of a caravan of tribute to the Wahhābī capital from Aleppo, indicating that at least some parts of Syria were under effective Wahhābī control during the 1790's.¹² By 1800, the Syrian-Istanbul pilgrimage was being intercepted—an event which had wide repercussions in trading circles, albeit a more precise knowledge of Syrian rural economy would help in understanding its significance. Further Wahhābī raids on the Ḥawrān and Jabal al-Shaykh regions were, moreover, practically unopposed. In fact, the Syrians, divided among themselves, were not able to make any effective response. The Wahhābīs were reformers, and in their political and military strategy they sought to drive a wedge between the wealthy merchants of the cities (and the regimes which supported them) and the poor. The Wahhābīs made inroads into Syria and, as will be shown, into Egypt, charging that the commercial elite represented corruption and decadence. But the Wahhābīs were suppressed militarily, and they failed at least in Damascus to shake the regime from within.

Paradoxically, the underlying cause of the Wahhābī campaign was itself conditioned by the same economic factors which had had such a profound effect on Damascus. As has been shown in Chapter 1, the Indian spice trade, which included indigo and textiles, contracted sharply during the second half of the eighteenth century as the British began to dominate the Indian economy.¹³ The decline of the Gujerat-Red Sea trade impoverished the Sharif of Mecca. When he lacked the money traditionally used to bribe and

buy the services of the tribes, the Wahhābīs arose in this hinterland as its economy in turn declined. The decline of the Indian trade to the Arab world, which Das Gupta has discussed, also had staggering effects on the Syrian merchant elite.

A traveler's account of the Indian trade from the vantage point of the 1830's suggested that it was in such a state of decline that the making of silk and gold fabric was finally being undertaken locally in Aleppo, as India was no longer a dependable source of supply. However, in recent years, even the number of Syrian artisans engaged in this craft had shrunk to no more than one thousand artisans, 20 percent of what their number had been before.¹⁴

Given the difference in the socioeconomic framework, it is not surprising to find that the reform-minded Şūfis who lived in the respective centers had quite different orientations. Naqshbandīs and Khalwatīs in Istanbul were oriented toward the sciences, history, and government service. In their writings of the eighteenth century, one finds a number of attempts to integrate the findings of Western positivist science into a holistic framework. Şūfis of these two orders in Damascus were not touched by these problems even in the early nineteenth century. In Damascus, systematic thought like the writings of Ibn al-ʿArabī was prized, while Ibn al-ʿArabī had long since lost his appeal among the upper class Şūfis in Istanbul. In Istanbul the Şūfis studied the scholastic sciences (*ʿulūm*), whereas in Damascus mystical experiences were reported, as were numerous lives given over to various forms of rigorous self-denial. With all this, Damascus was the freer literary environment.

An important point to note is the interconnectedness of Damascus and Istanbul in the period which we study. Numerous Damascenes went to Istanbul, became doctors, stayed, or returned to the Arab provinces. A number of Turks are reported who went to Damascus for study and who, as did one official, chose to be buried in a shrine of Ibn al-ʿArabī.¹⁵

Al-ʿAṭṭār in Turkey, 1802–1810

The effort which I have undertaken here to demonstrate the relationship between Damascus and the study of mysticism, between Istanbul and the rational sciences, the role of travel, and the importance of the major *ṭuruq* in the support of intellectual reform helps to explain the travels of *shaykhs* like Hasan al-ʿAṭṭār. It is no exaggeration to claim that the development of the indigenous culture was intimately related to the *ṭuruq*, as one can tell from a glance at the number of writers and poets who belonged to them, or from a consideration of those who supported the reform of Selim III, Mah-mud II, or Muḥammad ʿAlī. The intellectual orbit created by the Şūfī *ṭuruq* continued to show great vitality at the end of the eighteenth century and during the early years of the nineteenth century, before the industrial age

had fully undermined the traditional crafts and the regional commerce which supported the *ṭuruq*.

Al-ʿAṭṭār spent eight years at the beginning of the nineteenth century (1802–1810) in Turkey studying the rational sciences and then five years in Damascus, which were at least partly taken up with the study of Ibn al-ʿArabī. In this section an effort to reconstruct those years is undertaken. Al-ʿAṭṭār becomes both focus and example. The sources for this period in his life, that is, prior to his return to Egypt in 1815, are very few, and, worse, they contradict one another. The following itinerary, however, seems the most probable one. When al-ʿAṭṭār left Damietta in 1802, he went directly to Istanbul, where he occupied himself with the continuation of his still-uncompleted work on *ʿilm al-handasa* (geometry, including topics in astronomy and engineering). Al-ʿAṭṭār is known to have been in Istanbul in 1804.¹⁶ He himself stated that when he left Istanbul he went to Alexandretta, a town on the Turkish coast.¹⁷ His writings from Alexandretta permit this visit to be dated fairly precisely as having occurred during 1806–1807, the period in which he finished writing a grammar text.¹⁸ Elsewhere in the same text, al-ʿAṭṭār indicated that in 1807 he traveled from Alexandretta north to the Black Sea coast. He also visited İzmir and made a serious commitment to study medicine.¹⁹

The desire to study medicine would logically induce him to return to Istanbul (or its suburb Scutari). Approximately in 1808, al-ʿAṭṭār's first writing on medicine, a work on anatomy, appeared. While this cannot be proven from the text itself, there are several indirect pieces of evidence. First, his student Muḥammad al-ʿAṭṭār studied medicine in Istanbul. Second, Hasan al-ʿAṭṭār, in his major work on medicine, mentioned his interest in the work of European doctors and hospitals, which he stated were located in Istanbul or its suburbs. This leads us to conclude that between 1808 and 1810 he was in the Istanbul area studying medicine, on which he later wrote when he was teaching medicine in Damascus. Of the other works which he wrote (which were not located), notably, the "*Tuhfa*," the most logical time of composition would be between 1803 and 1806. The success of this work, of which he was to boast many years later, might well have facilitated his obtaining a post in Alexandretta and perhaps also eased the situation when he wanted to study medicine. In 1810 (there is no doubt about this date), he left Turkey for Damascus (see Appendix II).

Al-ʿAṭṭār's Associates in Turkey

In Istanbul, al-ʿAṭṭār knew several of the leading intellectuals of the period. At the time of his arrival or shortly thereafter, the group which he knew manifested strong opposition to Selim, even helping to bring about his overthrow. Al-ʿAṭṭār also entered another circle, which included some Europeans, while he was living in the house of the Hakimbashī and studying medicine. How he met these people, and how easily he adjusted to his new

situation, is not known. We do know that he studied Turkish while he was there, but how far he progressed is again not known. In one work, we find praise of a certain Turkish grammar book.²⁰

A prominent Ottoman who knew the writings of the Wafā'iya in Egypt very probably knew al-'Aṭṭār; at least, among his works is a translation in which some of al-'Aṭṭār's writings appear. This was the Mulla Ahmad Asim Efendi (1755-1819/1169-1235), a writer and translator. He translated al-Zabīdī's dictionary, "Tarjamat al-qāmūs li-Firūzabādī," and it was published in Turkey. He composed his own works in the Arabic language and wrote on Ottoman history. In 1810/1225 he finished the translation of al-Jabartī's *Mazhar al-taqdīs bi khurūj ṭā'ifat al-Farānsīs*, which contained selections by al-'Aṭṭār, as has been previously noted. Ahmad Asim was a chronicler of the period of Ottoman history through which he was living, and from his work, one can identify his sympathies with Mehmet Ata'ullah (died 1811/1226), a person with whom al-'Aṭṭār definitely had some relationship.²¹ Al-'Aṭṭār's attraction to this group is understandable on several grounds. Neither he nor they were opponents of reform—quite the contrary—but they did oppose the giving over of real power to foreigners and the needless breaking with indigenous reform traditions which Selim permitted.²² From everything we know of al-'Aṭṭār's later life in Egypt, he stood for very much the same principles while he was in the service of Muḥammad 'Alī. No doubt his contact with these religious officials had occurred in his first stay in Istanbul, during the period when he was studying and writing on *ilāhiyāt* (theology).²³ Al-'Aṭṭār makes clear that when he was in Istanbul studying medicine, he was living with a Hakimbashi. This would clearly seem to be the "second stay."²⁴

As al-'Aṭṭār indicated, he had sought to study medicine in his youth, but this was not possible for him in Egypt. Among his earliest writings in Istanbul, which he wrote after leaving Egypt, was a work based on Ibn Sīnā. This work, a study of anatomy, was completed in 1803/1223. Later, his friend and student Muḥammad al-'Aṭṭār undertook to write a commentary on it.²⁵ After writing this work, al-'Aṭṭār began to learn of advances in European medicine and other medical traditions in Islam. He became encouraged to criticize Ibn Sīnā. He told of this change in his major work on medicine, written in 1814, which included some of his experiences in studying medicine in Istanbul:

Concerning the study of the structure of the human body, to see how it is composed of tissues, nerves, and other things: this is done through dissection, that is, through cutting it up into pieces, just as one examines meat. This dissection is done up until the present time in . . . the European countries. At the time I was in Istanbul, I asked some European doctors about it, and they informed me that in their country there is a place called the dissection room [Tashrihkāna]. The doctors go there for their meetings with their students and bring the dead which had died during the day ignoring whether or not the dead

person was famous or the reason for his death. Then they dissect him piece by piece, using special instruments. The students take the pieces in order to learn—some the head, others the hand, others the intestine, and in this way they proceed in their training. Many of the European and Turkish doctors continue this tradition, and they have persons who are skilled [*ashkhaş*, perhaps assistants] who study what they have observed of the body's structure.

Some of the Muslim doctors also have skilled personnel in the medical school in Istanbul—and there remains in this school [after dissection takes place] only some veins, bones, and leftover pieces from corpses, which are then placed in a spot in the school for the qualified people to examine. When I used to read books in that school at various times, I tried not to look at these displays, as to look at such things made me depressed.

Al-Qurashī said in his commentary on the *Qānūn* that dissection of bones and joints and what lies next to them is simple in dead persons regardless of the cause of death. . . .

Al-Anṭakī said that, according to Ibn Sīnā, the most conclusive approach to anatomy is through reading the well-established findings of a skilled man with precise knowledge in it. By this he meant that the usefulness of anatomy is the deductions [*istidlāl*] from the findings of a man who knows everything well. . . . It is known, however, that dissection begins with the observation of the strange things of kings and kingdoms and with the making known of the secrets of the divinity; and it is a science which cannot seriously be pursued except with one's two eyes. What one learns by way of logical proofs [*barāhīn*] is not useful. We have been dissuaded from the pursuit [of the empirical approach] because it has been considered an obstacle to God's law and to faith, and an impediment to His Mercy and Charity which dwells in our hearts.

But for this reason it might be said that there exist two sciences, the careful study of which leads to a growing certitude concerning the wonders of Creation and the masterful skill of God—and these two fields are '*ilm al-hay'a*' and '*ilm al-tashrīḥ*' [astronomy and empirical anatomy]. And I say that these two fields transform the mind, but that precision in the knowledge of them is concealed from the masses. For that reason you will see that the majority of distinguished people in our time have not been influenced at all by these two fields. In fact, these fields are almost nonexistent now, except among a very small number of people, who save us from ignorance.²⁶

Additional comments on his contacts with Europeans and European medicine appear in the same work, giving us a small clue to the way in which he met the Europeans during his stay in Istanbul. He stated that he lived with a Hakimbashī while he was in Istanbul, and that he had a very enjoyable time with him. He studied with him and made considerable progress.

Among the works which he read with the Hakimbashi was the "Mūjaz al-qānūn," a shortened form of the main work of Ibn Sīnā, by Ibn al-Naffīs. He also read the commentary literature on Ibn Sīnā.²⁷ In another passage, in a discussion of the difficulty of deducing clear medical conclusions from the pulse, he returned to the subject of foreign doctors. "And when I was in Istanbul all the doctors of different nationalities used to frequently meet in a place where I was staying in the house of the chief of the doctors [Dar Reis ul-Atibba, i.e., the Hakimbashi's house]. I used to ask them about the pulse, but I did not find a single one of them who was certain about it. I asked some who were well versed, and they said that it was not known about except by a very few individuals who were to be found in Europe."²⁸ One Hakimbashi, Mehmet Ataullah, at this time gained some fame through his son Shaykh Shani Zadeh, whom he sent to Italy to study medicine, and who returned to write the first modern textbook of anatomy written by a Turk. Whether this Hakimbashi was the same one whom al-'Aṭṭār knew cannot be determined, but it seems probable.²⁹

Al-'Aṭṭār in Syria, 1810-1815

In 1810/1225, al-'Aṭṭār arrived in Damascus and took up residence in a Ḥanafī *madrasa*, the Madrasat al-Badr'iya, which, he stated, was well organized and at the same time offered seclusion.³⁰ He had barely been there a month, during which time he was writing a work on *adāb al-baḥṭh* [argumentation], when an opportunity arose for him to visit Jerusalem. "After my return to Damascus from Turkey, I had begun writing [a certain book] until Rabi' al-Thānī 1225 [May 1810], arriving at the chapter titled 'Taqsīm'; and then the opportunity arose to visit Jerusalem. So I left what I wrote in Damascus and visited the Bayt al-Maqdis on the 16th on Sha'bān 1225 [September 16, 1810]; and then I traveled about in this area, returning to Damascus in Rabi' al-Thānī 1226 [May 1811], and completed the work with waning energy and growing laziness on the 24th of Sha'bān [September 13, 1811]."³¹ Al-'Aṭṭār went with some Syrians who were traveling on horseback. They proceeded first to Ma'n, then to Hebron where al-'Aṭṭār stayed for ten days, and then proceeded to Jerusalem where al-'Aṭṭār stayed with the Naqīb al-Ashraf, al-Sayyid 'Umar Efendi.³²

Probably at the time of his return to the Madrasat al-Badr'iya, there occurred the incident involving Shaykh Muḥammad al-Misrī. He was a friend of al-'Aṭṭār, and his stay in the same *madrasa* for a period specified as having been two months was a source of great happiness for al-'Aṭṭār. As it is estimated that al-'Aṭṭār stayed for no more than one month in the *madrasa* in 1810, this event must have occurred somewhere between 1811 and 1815. Muḥammad al-Misrī was one of the few Egyptian '*ulamā*' who had intellectual relations with the French during the Napoleon invasion of Egypt. He wrote a letter to Napoleon describing the treasures of Egypt (which he said were "greater than musk and amber"), notably the archeological remains of

Pharaonic times. He urged Napoleon to make a law to stop the pillaging of these ruins, which Napoleon did. Napoleon reported meeting Shaykh al-Miṣīrī and discussing religious matters related to the celebration of the birthday of the Prophet. He was one of the principal *shaykhs* of Alexandria, and these contacts did nothing to tarnish his reputation. In fact, he played an active role at the time of the British invasion of Alexandria.³³

After al-Miṣīrī left the *madrasa*, he sent a *qasīda* from Bayrūt praising Damascus, its '*ulamā*' and merchants with whom he had been staying. A part of this poem was not acceptable to the '*ulamā*' of Madrasat al-Badr'iya because of its wording and its rhyme schemes, and it caused a great stir.³⁴ If it could be located, this poem might be found to be a part of the intellectual development of Egyptians who, as did al-Diṣṭqī or Barbīr, went to Damascus as rebels against Egyptian culture as they found it.

Other biographical information included in the last of the books which al-'Aṭṭār wrote in Damascus (the commentary on al-Anṭākī) shows that he stayed in the *madrasa* until he departed for the Ḥijāz in 1813/1228, or slightly later, making the Hījj on the way home to Egypt.

Al-'Aṭṭār had two main students in Syria, although many others doubtless attended his courses. The more devoted of these two was Muḥammad al-'Aṭṭār (Muḥammad b. Ḥusayn al-Ḥanafī, died 1827/1243). He had known Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār from Istanbul as well as from Damascus. In his commentary on al-'Aṭṭār's essay on anatomy, he included a biographical fragment on his teacher which has previously been mentioned. In this biography, he stated that Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār had asked him to write this commentary; later, in Damascus, Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār was also to write a commentary on his own text. Muḥammad al-'Aṭṭār, as did Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār, studied the natural sciences and medicine in Istanbul. Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār assisted him in writing a commentary on a text in medicine. Muḥammad al-'Aṭṭār assisted Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār in his writing and teaching of *ādāb al-baḥth*, and loaned him several books to help him understand the Walādiya text. Muḥammad al-'Aṭṭār, whose main reputation was in the natural sciences, as will be discussed in Chapter 8, had one student in the natural sciences who was quite well known. His name was 'Abdullah Efendī al-Aṣṭuwānī (died 1845/1262), called al-Fālākī.³⁵

While Muḥammad al-'Aṭṭār studied medicine and science, Ḥasan al-Bayṭār al-Naqshbandī (died 1865/1282), Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār's other principal student, studied *fiqh* and the legal sciences. Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār was described as being a father and spiritual guide to him. He gave him much of his time. He even taught him *ḥadīth*. It was at this point that al-'Aṭṭār, far from Egypt, wrote his only work (which has not been located) on *ḥadīth*, "*Ḥaṣhiyat al-nukhba fī 'ulūm al-ḥadīth*," drawn from the Imām Ibn al-Ṣalāh (perhaps from his *Muqaddima*). Al-'Aṭṭār also taught him *fiqh*, a field in which he made such rapid progress that he was sought after to perform public functions before he had reached the age of thirty. Al-Bayṭār, like al-'Aṭṭār, had important connections in Istanbul. In later years he was a friend of Şeyh ul-Islām Arif Hikmet Bey, with whom he shared an interest in

ḥadīth and *tafsīr*. It was perhaps not a coincidence that his Shaykh al-Islām had been Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār's student in Egypt during the 1820's, when he was then the Ottoman Qāḍī in Egypt. Al-Bayṭār, too, had students in *fiqh*, among them a Shādhilī Ṣūfī named Sa'īd al-Khalīdī (died 1877/1294), who traveled in Azerbaijan.³⁶

While in Turkey, al-ʿAṭṭār had decided to go to Damascus in order to meet the Khalwatī Ṣūfī Shaykh al-ʿArīf bi'llah al-Shaykh ʿUmar al-Yāfi, who was deeply versed in the study of Ibn al-ʿArabī. When al-ʿAṭṭār arrived in Damascus, it was al-Yāfi who wrote in praise of al-ʿAṭṭār's essay against the *Ṭarīqa muḥammadiyya*.³⁷ Al-Yāfi, as it turned out, was a specialist in literature. His interests in Ibn al-ʿArabī were at least partly literary. He himself wrote wine poetry and *muwashshahāt*. Al-Yāfi was a disciple of a person who was well known in Egypt, Muṣṭafā al-Bakrī, founder of the Bakrīya. This social link, combined with an interest in literature, made him naturally a person to whom al-ʿAṭṭār might gravitate. Al-Yāfi had a number of students and close associates who formed a circle in Damascus at the beginning of the nineteenth century. A limited amount of information makes it possible to reconstruct this circle. His most devoted follower, and his inseparable companion, was Shaykh Muṣṭafā Zayn al-dīn al-Ḥimṣī, a musician as well as a student of poetry and history. Al-Ḥimṣī traveled with his *shaykh*, al-Yāfi, to Istanbul. Shaykh al-Ḥimṣī was a friend of an Ottoman *wazīr* named Abdullah Pasha. Through his good offices, it was possible for the two of them to meet Sultan Abd ul-Aziz, who honored them. A second student of al-Yāfi was ʿUmar al-Mujtāhid b. Shaykh Aḥmad al-Midānī. He became a Khalwatī from al-Yāfi and then a Naqshbandī from Khālīd. He also studied with al-ʿAṭṭār's student Ḥasan al-Bayṭār, and was known for his piety.³⁸ A Khalwatī *shaykh* bearing the name Ṣāliḥ al-Yāfi lived in the same *madrasa* in Damascus as Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār. He wrote numerous works and had students. What his relationship to ʿUmar al-Yāfi or al-ʿAṭṭār may have been is not known.³⁹

The main influence of al-Yāfi was obviously literary, if one is to judge from al-ʿAṭṭār's achievements while in Damascus. First, while in Damascus, al-ʿAṭṭār edited the *Diwān* of Ibn Sahl. He also composed some original poetry which is lost; some of this was wine poetry, some *muwashshahāt*, like the poetry of his teacher and like that of Ibn Sahl. When he referred to Ibn al-ʿArabī, he referred to the latter's poetry in *Sharḥ turjūmān al-ashwāq*, not to theology.⁴⁰

Damascus was not reputed to have been a center of the rational sciences or medicine in the eighteenth century.⁴¹ In general, it can be stated that, since Damascus was a center for mystical studies (while those Syrians who were interested in the study of physical medicine generally gravitated toward Istanbul), it would have been a very inhospitable atmosphere for the findings of Western medicine which interested al-ʿAṭṭār. Yet, al-ʿAṭṭār had many students there in his courses on anatomy, among them one *shaykh* who became a leading doctor in Syria. Al-ʿAṭṭār was not the only teacher of medicine. There was also Shaykh Ibrāhīm al-Khulāṣī (died 1840/1255), who

was described as a specialist on the pulse and eyeballs and had written a book on these subjects. This may account for al-'Aṭṭār's reticence on the subject of the pulse.⁴² Shaykh Ibrāhīm, his brother Ṭālib (died 1877/1294), and 'Abd al-Qādir al-Khulāṣī (died 1868/1282) were all from a family in Aleppo which produced a number of famous doctors.⁴³ Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār's student 'Abd al-Qādir was also the student of his father, Ibrāhīm. A medical diploma from Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār to 'Abd al-Qādir still exists.⁴⁴ Al-'Aṭṭār also helped his friend and student Muḥammad al-'Aṭṭār write a commentary on the *Qanūnja* of al-Jaghminī. According to his son, he wrote other works as well, but these have not been located. It is clear from al-'Aṭṭār's main work that, as long as he taught in the holistic framework of Ibn Sīnā, he did not have to agree with him, even in Damascus, just so he was tactful.

A study of the social history of Istanbul and Damascus clarifies a point of considerable importance to Egyptian intellectual history, the fate of the Ṣūfī intellectuals. In Egypt, they declined with the suppression of merchant capital. It is difficult, especially in the Muḥammad 'Alī period, to find their views expressed. In Turkey, the conservative orders were secure members of the state bureaucracy. A comparison is thus possible between the Naqsh-bandī and Khalwatī Ṣūfis of the early nineteenth century, bureaucrat versus merchant. In Istanbul, Ṣūfis worked in the state bureaucracy and appeared to lose contact with experiential mysticism. They suffered a fragmentation in thought. This did not happen to Ṣūfis of these same orders who lived and worked in Damascus. The "experiential" Ṣūfism was possible only as an opposition force in modern Turkey and Egypt; and as such it has played an important role, especially in the twentieth century.

A number of Ottomans came to Egypt and helped Muḥammad 'Alī carry out his reforms. From a survey of the social history of Turkey, it is striking to find that reformists in Turkey encountered many frustrations. In fact Egypt could appear to certain Turks, as it later did to Saint-Simonians, as a place for a fresh start. The dominant state commercial sectors of Turkey and Egypt, post-1815, contained a number of similarities which permitted Ottomans to move easily from Turkey to Egypt. The life and writings of Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār during his formative years in Istanbul offer striking evidence of these trends.

By this, I am suggesting that the study of the individual has a larger significance which justifies the attention to biographical detail. How do the countries of the periphery restructure themselves as the world market continues to evolve? Clearly they do not have a structure which would simultaneously permit divergent cultural trends. This leaves travel and foreign education as a very important avenue of change. Al-'Aṭṭār's early life shows alienation with the conditions prevailing in Egypt during his youth. His travel to Istanbul and his association with the intellectual elite during the period of his study of rational sciences were obviously part of a very common pattern for intellectuals from the Ottoman provinces. His subsequent efforts to integrate the new knowledge into a holistic framework in Damascus was also quite common, as I will show in Chapter 9. Damascus repre-

sents for al-'Aṭṭār a parting of the ways with his own past. He takes his last steps in late Andalusian literature and gradually abandons it for fields more congruent with the new, more hierarchically organized, pragmatically oriented age of reformism. The travels of al-'Aṭṭār draw attention to a point which heretofore has not been stressed in scholarly writings, notably that a *de facto* division of labor in culture existed among the principal centers of the Ottoman Empire in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Travel in this context was the norm for the scholar; the study of cultural development in any one center must take cognizance of this larger totality. The importance of travel for intellectuals in the periphery is suggested already in a main argument of the second chapter of this work, where I argue that later Sunnī societies are rooted in a single modality of logic embodied in a single prominent root of Islamic jurisprudence at any one given time. Where one finds in the industrial heartlands the seeds of an opposition culture emerging and presaging social change within the framework of national culture, transitions in the periphery from one social formation to another, from one cultural pattern to another, do not have this attribute. The inorganic character of this change no doubt presents opportunities to groups possessed of certain traits of flexibility, traits shared particularly by the minorities of the Mediterranean. The biographical details of al-'Aṭṭār's adjustment to the new age are not full enough for me to show that he redeveloped a very profound aesthetic. In the ninth chapter there is a discussion of science and music. Al-'Aṭṭār, writing as a bureaucrat in the reform movement, states that music is dangerous, as it appeals to the passions. Perhaps music is not wholly bad, for its use is sometimes necessary in order to inspire soldiers in battle.

Chapter 6

The Muḥammad 'Alī Period, 1815–1837:

State Commercial Sector and the Second Phase of the Cultural Awakening in Egypt

This chapter continues the analysis begun in Chapter 1 of the socioeconomic formation which characterized the Muḥammad 'Alī period, a formation dominated by a state commercial sector. This represented a precapitalist formation which was a transitional stage in Egypt's integration into the world market as a peripheral capitalist formation. During this phase, precapitalist and peripheral capitalist elements interpenetrated. The state was chief employer and paid cash wages: high wages to factory workers and students in the missions, and low wages to workers in the agricultural sector. Wage labor predominated throughout the economy, which was buffered by state policy from the direct impact of the world market. On the other hand, the major state projects relied on precapitalist relations of production, for example, the *corvée*, which was a throwback to the *wajba* of Ottoman times. Likewise, in industry the social relations of work corresponded more to the craft world than to the world of industry at the center of the world market. As the upper classes assimilated the technical progress of Europe, they became increasingly dependent on Europe. Revolutionary technology did not accompany the rise of a new class but prodded the evolution of an old one.

The regime's official ideology reflected these realities. The ruler appealed to his subjects, who were neither citizens of a nation-state nor members of a medieval millet, through the '*ulama*' chosen to speak for the regime. Medieval religious and cultural forms were followed when exhorting the draftees in the army, or to warn society at large of the dangers of the powerful Sānūsīya confraternity (which opposed the capitalist transformation), because these forms still adequately corresponded to social reality for the majority of the population. Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār was the most prominent example in the early bureaucratic period of an '*alim* who served the new regime and helped to forge its institutions and cultural direction. It is therefore appropriate to conclude the chapter with a section on his activities and those of his associates during this period.

The most important innovations in cultural life of the reform period were the new schools, the missions, the translation movement, and the corps of European technical advisers. These developments have not been sufficiently studied in terms of their contribution to the existing cultural life of Egypt. In order to understand this period in indigenous Egyptian terms, it is necessary to begin with an analysis of its religious framework. for this con-

tinued to be the primary framework of thought and culture for all classes. To these two points of reference, Europe and Islam, should be added the rise of the Arabic language as a rival to Turkish as the language of the ruling class.

I shall begin with a brief discussion of religion and culture as an introduction to the work of reformers, such as Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār, during the period from 1815 to 1837. In succeeding chapters I shall deal with jurisprudence, language sciences, literature, and the natural sciences in much greater depth.

The breakdown of the *ḥadīth* movement of the eighteenth century and its replacement by *fiqh* and *kalām*, which were revived during this particular historical period, encouraged the development of the rational sciences and a logical-deductive approach to all fields of learning in general. The reasons for this revival derive from economic development, as Egyptian merchant capitalism yielded to a state mercantile sector. The emergence of a dominant state capitalist sector necessitated a commitment to the explicit articulation of the law and, hence, a commitment to the study of theology. The theology which emerged was Māturīdite. It was built on rationalist tendencies which existed during the later eighteenth century and have already been discussed in the second chapter, but it took these tendencies much further than did earlier writers, such as al-Zabīdī, in response to changing social realities. In the eighteenth century, mechanisms of control were reinforced by religious culture and presupposed a degree of shared values which corresponded to the norms of the corporate age. During the reform period, law no longer functioned as the authoritative evocation of a moral image; it had to command an earthly loyalty, an obedience which it could not depend on without recourse to coercion; hence, the emphasis on *kalām*. Muḥammad 'Alī himself, of course, tried, as I have shown in chapter one, to wear the mantle of religion, that is, to blur the fundamental social changes; but with the emergence of class relations, the traditional social bonds dissolved and, with that, the whole nature of authority and legitimacy changed.

While there had been *qādis* in eighteenth-century Egypt, they had represented a system whose legitimacy was on the wane. In practice, order was maintained by the dominant class. In the reform period, there was an explicit institutionalization of authority, and the regime required official spokesmen, such as Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār, for its legitimacy. *Fiqh* became the basis of the culture of the ruling class, a culture which was permeated by the logical-deductive outlook which originated in its theology. In opposition to the culture of the ruling class was the culture of the depressed middle classes and artisans, based on *ḥadīth* and the popular Sūfī culture.

In the eighteenth century, the elite Sūfī orders represented the dominant Muslim elite culture. The ruling Mamlūks had become partially fused with certain segments of the middle classes, so that all the groups involved in the commercial revival were represented in the *turuq*. In the reform period, as I have already shown, the division between the ruling class and the indige-

nous middle class was the fundamental cleavage in the society. The importance of the popular culture lay only in its relation to the middle class, and it scarcely touched the elite at all. Thus, for the reform period, I shall concentrate on the culture of the ruling class. After 1830, the economic basis of the ruling class was weakened, and the Egyptian middle classes made a limited revival. This fact probably explains the resurgence of *ḥadīth* after the death of Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār.

The first impression one might receive after surveying the cultural and religious writings from 1815 to 1837 is that the shift to an emphasis on *kalām* and the methods of the rational sciences greatly broadened and deepened the possibilities inherent in the neoclassical revival. This was true in the case of a small number of intellectuals, such as al-'Aṭṭār, who consistently enjoyed the patronage of the authorities. But one cannot escape the fact that the number of books written during this period was very modest by comparison to that of the eighteenth century, and the literary production that did exist was more intensively channeled into fewer directions. It seems that the patronage that was available was administered far more rigidly than in the eighteenth century, and that this rigidity was in fact a benign manifestation of how the ruling class needed to function to adjust its production to the demands of the world market. The general pace of cultural life slowed, and there is no doubt that it deteriorated. Not only did no one produce a history on the scale of al-Jabartī's or a dictionary based on the scholarly learning of such a figure as al-Zabīdī, but also the general quality of textbooks declined. The fields of literature and philology in particular suffered severe dislocation, despite the efforts of al-'Aṭṭār and others to keep on teaching these subjects in the spirit of the eighteenth-century *majlīs* and to prevent the emergence of a debased court culture.

The Arabic language suddenly became necessary for running the state. The use of Ottoman Turkish as the language of administration and government, which had been the practice for three hundred years, was largely abandoned in the space of a few years. The ethnic cleavage on which the use of Ottoman was based, and which was beginning to give way in the eighteenth century, gave way to a class cleavage. Arabic developed with incredible rapidity, but it did not develop freely or organically. Its development, like that of theology, was conditioned by the needs of the ruling class. The chief centers for literary production under the regime of Muḥammad 'Alī were journalism and the press. This had the effect of flooding the language with neologisms and transliterated terms, while no corresponding development either in the rules of language or in style (philology and literature) took place. Certain problems had to be solved quickly, while others were ignored. When the students returned from their mission in Europe, they could not translate their new knowledge into a suitable form of Arabic. It required Arabic literary editors to make their efforts comprehensible and precise. Analogous problems existed in journalism. In the two areas of professional and literary editing, there existed the necessary institutional basis, however limited, for a continued pursuit of Arabic studies, and talented

figures in Arabic philology and literature were drawn to it. This work was extremely demanding, for it required a vast knowledge of terms in medieval technical fields, a capacity for linguistic innovation, and a sense of style and presentation, if need be, of unfamiliar subjects. Hasan al-'Aṭṭār was the leading figure in this group until 1830. In studying this period of his life, one gains a deep insight into the second phase of the indigenous cultural revival.

The New State Commercial Sector, 1815–1837

After the destruction of the Mamlūks, the new upper class was comprised of those groups whose services and loyalties Muḥammad 'Alī's Turco-Albanian bureaucratic elite could depend on. These were groups which opposed the Egyptian middle classes. In fact, the principal dialectic in Egyptian history from the rise of Muḥammad 'Alī in 1805 to 1815 and even afterward was Muḥammad 'Alī's relationship with the indigenous middle classes which had brought him to power. When Muḥammad 'Alī reconquered the Delta and the Ṣa'īd, and eliminated both the Mamlūks and the Albanian soldiery from the scene, he was able to turn directly against the middle classes and expropriate their wealth. But prior to this there were many signs of an impending collision. The crisis which precipitated this collision was the prolonged and indecisive Wahhābī war, which drained Egypt and weakened Muḥammad 'Alī. Muḥammad 'Alī was of course unable to refuse the Ottoman demand that he prosecute this war, but at the same time he was unsure of the loyalty of the home front. Thus, for both economic and political reasons Muḥammad 'Alī took direct control of the country's agricultural production in 1815. Government financing of agriculture had important social consequences, for it eliminated the role of the local merchant as financier.¹ This was particularly important in the Delta, which produced many raw materials and was the most important agricultural area in the country. Muḥammad 'Alī virtually tried to replace the Egyptian Delta merchants with government officials and foreign merchants² whom he selected. This lower officialdom was drawn from a class traditionally antagonistic to the merchants: the village *shaykhs*.

The composition of the ruling class between 1815 and 1837 has been described in most historical studies in terms of ethnic cliques. The groups considered to have been the most powerful changed every few years. It would seem that, despite the array of different ethnicities which had some power in the government, the general policy of the government was altered more as a consequence of material constraints than by considerations of ethnic solidarity of any given clique. Hence, it would seem that whether Muḥammad 'Alī favored his "old lions," the Albanians, who had been with him from his days in the Boyūk (soldier band), or the "Moreates," who came later, policy changes did not emanate from this fact alone.³

A key characteristic of this period was that the ruling class retained power by avoiding a direct confrontation with the Europeans, a mistake

which cost the Mamlūks dearly. It did so by making concessions and by playing one power against another. The institutional structure imposed by the ruling class was dictated by the general contours of the society, a society composed of a depressed middle class and a large peasantry. The large new bureaucracy reflected the efforts of the small ruling class to mobilize the society, structured as it was to extract the greatest possible wealth from the peasantry. Changes were introduced selectively so as to preserve the general structure of the society; it was only as a result of lack of alternatives that in the 1830's the government was obliged to promote many more Egyptians within the structure to promote necessary efficiency.

Some studies of this period have devoted considerable attention to the monarchical form of the ruling class, insisting that the important decisions were made by the ruling family. Indeed, Muḥammad 'Alī and his son Ibrāhīm, and certain trusted military men, held the highest ranks and gradually amassed large landholdings. But this group did not possess technical skills. They were largely bypassed in military affairs by junior technical officers, and in civilian affairs (at least, during the period from 1819 to 1837) for the same reason. They do not stand out as having had a monopoly of effective power. One is led to suppose, thus, that the wealth which they received was not absolutely indicative of their capacity to influence the course of events in the society.

A more accurate picture of the ruling class which had emerged by 1830 would thus include the family of Muḥammad 'Alī, the Turkish and Albanian commanders, foreign technocrats, and representatives of the new Chamber of Commerce.⁴ The continuing necessity to increase state revenues forced the government to attempt to increase agricultural productivity. This involved the regime in agrarian problems, the solution of which necessitated an expansion of the bureaucracy and an inclusion of a larger number of Egyptians in it. The formation of the Council (Majlis al-Mashūra) in 1829, which was made up largely of Egyptians, is frequently pointed to as a counterweight to Turks and foreigners. One might note, however, that no evidence has been given to support the view that its behavior in any way justified such a claim. It was composed of 146 members who served the government as consultants: 23 high functionaries and '*ulama*', 99 notables and *shaykhs* from the provinces, and 24 *ma'mūrs* (administrators) of the provinces. The vast majority thus came from the village *shaykhs* or notables, a group which was among the earliest supporters of the regime of Muḥammad 'Alī. Perhaps one should argue that for the most part this assembly was "anti-Egyptian," because it brought together the forces in the society which exploited the peasantry and blocked the growth of the Egyptian middle class.⁵

The final phase which the ruling class underwent in the reform period was its own transformation from a bureaucratic class into the beginnings of a large landholding class. The land was still theoretically owned by the state. After 1837, however, it could be willed to one's heirs, not as private property but as the right to the wealth from the land which was still nom-

inally the possession of the state. What had happened to permit this is well known: Muḥammad 'Alī suffered defeats as the Europeans rapidly expanded in Syria and other areas. The central government had grown weaker. As a consequence, the bureaucracy could no longer attempt industrialization, and it even ceased to provide an efficient managerial arrangement for an agricultural economy. For the period had seen a rapid development of a financial system which could provide for agricultural credit and further improvements in agricultural technology, at the same time permitting a considerable degree of decentralization.⁶ The breakdown of the bureaucracy meant the breakdown of the cultural movements which the bureaucracy represented in the assimilation of foreign knowledge and the neoclassical revival. A third phase reached its culmination a generation later under the bureaucratic regime of Isma'il.

The Old Middle Classes

The socioeconomic situation of the old middle classes in the reform period remains unstudied, and what has generally been stated about the situation of either the Egyptian merchants or the '*ulamā*' as a whole is based on very few examples. The contemporary European writers had few contacts and were much less interested in these groups than in the government itself. A small amount of information is to be found on the merchant elite which had grown out of this class because it was actually a part of the government.⁷ For example, one can learn that the president of the Chamber of Commerce in Cairo in 1833 was Aḥmad al-Gharbī and that his brother Muḥammad was also a Cairo merchant; also, that this family maintained close ties with the Maghrib and its politics and that Aḥmad had loaned money to various persons there.⁸ The Maghribī merchants invested by proxy in the Indian trade route to Jidda through the main merchants in Jidda, who in 1830 were two Maghāriba named al-Jaylāni and al-Saqqāt. These merchants apparently accepted investment from the Cairo Maghāriba but not from the Syrian merchants in Cairo. They were also heavily involved in the coffee trade, although they did not sell to Egypt because Muḥammad 'Alī's blockade was still strong enough for him to resist West Indian coffee and to buy Yamanī coffee instead.⁹ But apart from a few references to this elite, no clear picture of the merchants can be drawn from the published sources, foreign or indigenous, for the reform period except for those in the Sudan trade.¹⁰

The other main component of the urban middle classes, notably the '*ulamā*', has been frequently discussed. The Egyptian '*ulamā*' have recently been contrasted with their contemporaries, the Turkish '*ulamā*', on the issue of reform. The Turks supported reform whereas the Egyptians did not. The reasons which are given for this difference vary. One is that Muḥammad 'Alī ignored al-Azhar and ruled around it rather than reforming it from within. He honored the '*ulamā*' but never gave them any effective power.¹¹

This view is correct, but the reasons why the *'ulamā'* chose not to support Muḥammad 'Alī from the beginning and why he opposed them need a deeper analysis.

From what is known about the *'ulamā'* in the eighteenth century and the early nineteenth century, it seems that they had deep-rooted relationships with the world of commerce and the guilds. A few of the most wealthy held *iltizāms*. When the government took control of trade, removing it from the hands of the merchants, and when it placed a new administrative structure in control of the guilds, it was striking at the heart of the economic world of the majority of the *'ulamā'*. Some *'ulamā'* were themselves merchants, involved with the guilds. Many derived their income from serving as *nuzzār* of the *awqāf* of religious buildings and institutions. When the ruling alliance took over the administration of these buildings, it deprived them of this source of wealth. Thus, there were objective grounds for the outright opposition of the *'ulamā'* to the ruling alliance, their opposition to its policies being but the most visible expression of the opposition of the entire middle class.¹²

But if the ruling alliance could control the wealth of the *'ulamā'*, why was it not able to break them entirely and force them to either emigrate or accept reform? One must conclude that, despite the inroads which it made in their wealth and power, it was not strong enough vis-à-vis these legitimizers of its authority to break their power completely. There was no strong external or internal threat, as in Istanbul, which forced the *'ulamā'* to side with the rulers. The conscription policy of the new ruling class removed any internal threats from the lower classes, who could be transferred easily to foreign battlefields. Still, the ruling alliance had to listen to the "complaints" of these *'ulamā'* and go through the motions of extending certain honors to them. This would seem to reflect a power relationship in which, although it had the upper hand, it could not do without the *'ulamā'*.

Muḥammad 'Alī appointed a number of *shaykhs* to the key position of Rector, or Shaykh, of al-Azhar. It has been observed that for the most part they were either too old or too weak to organize effective opposition to Muḥammad 'Alī, even if they were so disposed. No inquiry has been made, however, as to what was their probable attitude toward Muḥammad 'Alī and the new regime. While I have no direct evidence, there is considerable indirect evidence from literary sources. All those who were chosen, with the exception of Hasan al-'Attār, grew up in the circles of *ḥadīth* study of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. They had thus spent their lives among persons who later opposed Muḥammad 'Alī. Muḥammad 'Alī was aware of the futility of attempting to co-opt them and merely sought to neutralize their opposition. He permitted the *shaykhs* to choose elderly men, whose death in any case made for a large turnover.

Only Hasan al-'Attār tried to function as one of Muḥammad 'Alī's "men," and this was at the height of the regime's power. Even then Muḥammad 'Alī did not make the appointment until 1831.¹³ As will be shown

below, the *shaykhs* ganged up on al-'Aṭṭār, and his period as rector, until his death in 1835, was singularly unproductive as well as personally uncomfortable.

In 1838, Shaykh Ibrāhīm al-Bājūrī came to power as rector as the result of an explicit compromise. He had made a written promise to al-Bakrī that he would keep out of Šūfī affairs and that he would not act in matters concerning al-Azhar without first conferring with the other '*ulamā*'. This shows clearly enough that the power of the '*ulamā*' vis-à-vis the government had slightly increased.¹⁴

Returning to the "complaints" of the '*ulamā*' to which Muḥammad 'Alī listened, one can find a number which have a fairly clear relationship to social and economic cleavages. In 1822, some '*ulamā*' opposed the building of a hospital in Alexandria by the French at the Couvent de Pères de la Terre Sainte, citing a law which forbade the enlargement of monasteries. Muḥammad 'Alī intervened, financing the building of the hospital, insisting for the sake of the '*ulamā*' that a wall be built between the hospital and the convent.

Opposition to foreign penetration in the Delta caused a series of incidents which were simultaneously communal and economic. The Zaghlūl mosque in Rosetta figured as a rallying point, and Rosetta was the scene of recurrent opposition to the Franciscan missionaries from the Vatican. The Delta was at the same time experiencing an intensive penetration of foreign capital. One suspects that the importance of the region to the new regime led Muḥammad 'Alī to take steps to ensure his control. Muḥammad 'Alī concentrated most of the new institutions in the Cairo area, but he chose to locate the School of Arts and Crafts, founded in 1831, in Rosetta. Earlier, the Veterinary School founded by P. N. Hamont was also located there.¹⁵ At the same time that Muḥammad 'Alī made concessions, he also strongly attacked those who opposed him. In his observations on Egypt, written about 1830, Edward Lane discussed the prominence and strength of the Disūqiya (Šūfī order), who were based in Rosetta. The '*ulamā*' of Cairo "condemned" the practices of the Disūqiya as being contrary to Islam. At the same time, Muḥammad 'Alī went out of his way to mention his support for the Naqshbandiyya, a conservative and Shari'a-minded order which numbered among its ranks some of the high state officials.¹⁶

In general, contemporaries of the reform era emphasize the relative poverty of the *shaykhs* and how few among the names from the eighteenth-century *shaykhs* seem to appear in the nineteenth century. This shows how a profession which had been largely passed from father to son was changing. Edward Lane tells in quite vivid detail of the economic straits of the *shaykhs*, which is confirmed by other sources.¹⁷

The '*ulamā*' were quite successful in making "religious" demands on Muḥammad 'Alī, that is, demands in which class conflict was not so obvious. One study based on the Turkish archival sources lists a number of cases in which Muḥammad 'Alī was obliged to eliminate or diminish the power of certain persons who annoyed the '*ulamā*'; cases in which he

granted the '*ulamā*' tax concessions or customs exemptions on their goods, and cases in which he facilitated the Pilgrimage, gave money to support poor *shaykhs*, and gave special money to support Turkish '*ulamā*'. Naturally, these were not altruistic gestures; he hoped to gain support by making them. But this fact alone makes it clear that the '*ulamā*' were still a force to be reckoned with and that they could not be easily bypassed.¹⁸

Another approach to an estimation of the relative strength of the Egyptian middle classes lies in a consideration of the more Shari'a-minded Sūfī confraternities. It is generally accepted that the government of Muḥammad 'Alī attempted to dominate the *ṭuruq* as much as possible thru the office of the Shaykh Mashāyikh al-Ṭuruq; nonetheless, the Sūfī orders continued somewhat independently.¹⁹ Rapid expansion of different branches and offshoots of the Khalwatiya continued uninterruptedly during the first half of the nineteenth century. Branches of the order reached the Maghrib, the Sudan, and, after the Wahhābī wars, the Hījāz. These branches in time became separate orders, clearly independent of Egypt. The paths they followed were the traditional trade routes, and the *zāwīyas* were established in trade centers. There is no doubt that the moving force behind this spread was the merchants, whose conservative religious doctrine had some degree of support from various local rulers.²⁰ Independent movements led by merchants in Egypt were suppressed ruthlessly.²¹

In Egypt itself, the two national shrine cults which had played a central role in the cultural revival of the eighteenth century, the Khalwatiya Bakriya and the Sādāt al-Wafā'iya, exercised a degree of influence in the first half of the nineteenth century, although organizationally they were in a state of decline. In the circles of the Wafā'iya, the name of Muḥammad Abī Anwār continued to be cherished by the belletrists. His name was repeatedly mentioned in their poetry, and the cultural tradition of the Fāṭimids and of Persia was still occasionally referred to in their writings. In the reform period, Wafā'i members, because of their knowledge of language and literature, gained most of the few important jobs which were open to Egyptians (see below). Through the influence of Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār, some worked on the official newspaper, *Al-Waqā'i' al-Miṣriyya*,²² in the Būlāq Press, and in the correction of translations. At least one of their group did literary translations, Shaykh al-Ṭaḥṭāwī. However, comparatively little is known, and this is important, about the persons who became Shaykh al-Sijāda and who kept the order functioning. After Muḥammad Abī Anwār, one family dominated the order for three generations, and of these three generations, the grandson seemed to have been the only important personality. Of the first generation, Shaykh Sayyid al-Sādāt, little is recorded; his son was Aḥmad Abū al-Nāṣir b. Sayyid al-Sādāt, known as Abū Iqbāl. The grandson was 'Abd al-Khāliq al-Sādāt, known as Abū'l-Futūḥāt, who was born in 1848/1263. 'Abd al-Khāliq studied in the Amiriya Madrasa, where Shaykh Muhammad 'Iyād al-Tantāwī was *nāzir*. The subjects which he studied included Turkish, Arabic grammar, handwriting, and arithmetic. He then entered al-Azhar and studied with Ibrahim al-Saqqā'. The relative

breakdown in *silsila* literature, which told of the series of links from the life of one Shaykh al-Sijāda to the next, does not mask the vitality and importance of the Wafā'iya as an institution, at least during the period of Muḥammad 'Alī. One can still, however, conclude from the available evidence that the Wafā'iya existed as a coherently functioning institution of the indigenous middle class, dependent of course on the wider patronage of a society which sympathized with its neoclassical outlook. Lane mentioned that it was customary to find, among the funeral processions of the wealthy, people reciting the Qur'ān and the traditional poem *Burda*, followed by four or more orders, each chanting one of its characteristic prayers. He mentioned in particular the Shādhiliya, the Wafā'iya, and the Sha'rāwī. This was in the 1830's.²³

The older Bakriya (there was no longer a reform movement) in the first half of the nineteenth century continued to be quite wealthy. A number of new suborders branched away from it and became independent. In Egypt the position of the main order was guaranteed by a special relationship to Muḥammad 'Alī. He had delegated to members of the order, on a permanent basis, the position of Naqib al-Ashraf, charging them with carrying out such annual celebrations as the Mawlid al-Nabi, which honored the Prophet's birthday. Sayyid 'Alī Efendi al-Bakrī al-Ṣiddiqī became Shaykh al-Sijāda after his father. In 1854–55/1271, he was known to have been on intimate terms with the Khedive Isma'il and urged him to avoid the penetration of foreign capital.²⁴

In conclusion, it would seem that the continuity and the relative importance of the Sharī'a-minded Ṣūfī orders in Egypt and their capacity for growth and expansion out from Egypt, especially along the trade routes, indicate the continuing strength of the middle classes under Muḥammad 'Alī. Muḥammad 'Alī may have given bequests, but he is not known to have "promoted" Ṣūfism. The middle class, composed of both merchants and 'ulamā', could be co-opted individually by Muḥammad 'Alī for certain rewards, but the majority could not be moved, despite the offers of honors and presents. This, too, is a clue to their relative strength. The conflict between the two classes carried over into every sphere of life. In religion, the middle classes supported the continuation of *ḥadīth* studies in the context of the Ṣūfī orders. The upper classes had meanwhile turned to *kalām*, and their lives revolved around the new institutions. In the cultural sphere, the conflict took the form of the issue of upper-class reform versus middle-class revival, with a small group seeking to bridge this cleavage.

The Lower Classes

In the absence of any socioeconomic study of the middle classes of Egypt, and with no correct information available on the way in which the local economies of Cairo and Alexandria were changing during the period of Muḥammad 'Alī, a study of the lower classes is all the more difficult. According to a recent study, the basic monopoly system which characterized the com-

mercial sector was created during the years 1816-1818. The "national" industries, a major employer of the urban lower classes, began with an artisanal form of production, with the government supplying the raw materials and taking the finished product. The office of market inspector, or *muḥtasib*, rose in importance, and some *muḥtasibūn* became known as tyrants. An anecdote is told by Lane about one inspector of cloth named 'Alī Bey who used to burn artisans who were caught selling their own linen or possessing a loom of their own.²⁵ The uprooting of the poorer craftsmen who lost this means of supplementing their income facilitated their induction into the state factories. One is in some ways reminded of the enclosure acts in England which helped to create an industrial proletariat. But in Egypt industrial revolution was hampered by the lack of essential raw materials, such as iron and coal, and by the lack of adequate sources of power. Furthermore, the rate of industrialization in Europe at this time was much greater than in Egypt; the pressure of cheap European machine goods prevented a fuller transformation of the lower classes in Egypt. The uprooting which had led either into the armies or into the factories came to a standstill with the decline of these institutions; the traditional modes of production continued. Nevertheless, during the height of the factory system, a situation resembling that of England in the time of the Luddites emerged. The pre-industrial lower classes demonstrated the limits to which traditional governmental coercive devices could be used in a modern work situation.²⁶ Contemporary observers reported many unexplained explosions and other acts of industrial sabotage. And Lane, for example, noted that the urban crime rate rose noticeably between his two visits in 1820 and 1833.²⁷

The application of the *corvée* to the problems of the creation of an army meant the breaking up of families and the uprooting of many members of society. The army also grew very rapidly from 16,000 in 1821 to 62,150 in 1829, then to 83,000 in 1832, 100,000 in 1833, and finally 157,000 in 1838. Numerous accounts of resistance to conscription are reported, especially of peasants who mutilated themselves. Reports, especially from the countryside, of revolts are mentioned; for example, in Sharqiya province, there were five separate revolts in fifteen years. There was, however, little opportunity for revolts in the army itself. The officer corps, which was highly paid, was ethnically and to a degree linguistically separated from the troops. Thus the officers, whether high or low, were not likely to provide the leadership for any revolt. But in the one important "near mutiny" which followed the failure of the siege of Acre in March 1832, those who were hung included 'ulamā' and some Turks.²⁸

A number of accounts of the popular Sūfī orders which engaged in "radical and dangerous" practices can be found in this period. These orders appear to be the heirs of the Bayyūmīs of the eighteenth century, but they had taken a turn toward even greater extremism than had the Bayyūmīs, reflecting the more oppressive conditions under Muhammad 'Alī. The Bayyūmīs themselves were weakened during the reform period, and under the

third *khalīfa*, Muḥammad Nāfi', there occurred a split in the organization. The main segment seemed to broaden its base from among the Cairo water carriers to include Bedouins as far away as the Hijāz.²⁹ The main popular orders of the reform period were not those which had been significant in the eighteenth century; they clearly rose in importance during this period. The most important was the Rifā'iya, a branch of which was called the 'Ilwāniya. They engaged in such practices as thrusting iron spikes through their bodies, eating live coals, and so forth. Members of another branch, the Sa'diyya, were known for their handling of poisonous snakes or riding horseback over their disciples. Some earned or probably supplemented their living by charming snakes out of people's houses. The second main order was the Qādiriyya. They were described as being mostly fishermen. The third main order was the Aḥmadiyya, the order of Sayyid Aḥmad al-Badawī. This last was centered in Tanṭā, in the Delta, although it had connections with the Bayyūmīs, the Sha'rāwīs, and the Shinnāwīs. Another branch was the Awlād al-Nūḥ; it had young men who paraded with swords, beads, and whips. A third popular order was also centered in the Delta; it was a branch of the Disūqiyya called the Burhāmiyya. Lane offered the opinion that almost all Ṣūfis, such as the Burhāmiyya, were artisans or farmers, that the majority participated only occasionally, and that only beggars and the poor, that is, those without other occupation, were engaged fulltime.

The practices described above scandalized the *shaykhs* of al-Azhar and the rest of the middle and upper classes, and this led the government to sponsor a more controlled version of the Mawlid al-Nabī. The extreme orientation toward ecstasy and the desire for escape from this life which were acted out symbolically in the rituals of these orders suggest the increasing misery and the growing exploitation of the lower classes. The widening social gap of the late eighteenth century was apparently only a foreshadowing of the far worse conditions which were to come in the reform period. Under such circumstances, one might expect a saint to arise to lead the people. This occurred at least once and with fairly spectacular results. In 1824, Aḥmad Idrīs, a Maghribī merchant, emerged as a *mahdī*, a charismatic leader claiming divine inspiration, and enlisted thousands of Upper Egyptian peasants to join a brief rebellion. Rebellions guided by ideology were, however, very rare. In this the lower-class movements of the eighteenth century and those of the nineteenth century appear to differ. In the nineteenth century, the Ṣūfī orientation mentioned above toward an individual social catharsis predominated over an impulse toward the development of social doctrine, all of which points to the conclusion that, temporarily at least, resistance was not institutionalized in the Nile Valley. The opposite was the case in the hinterlands of Egypt, for example, Libya and the Sudan. To restate the main premises of this discussion of social structure: the view that the dynamics of this period can be understood mainly in terms of intrabureaucratic politics of the elite is challenged by the view that the upper bureaucrats were the political center of a relatively small and coherent ruling class which pitted itself against the indigenous merchant

class of Egypt, the backbone of the eighteenth-century middle class. The bureaucracy was a traditional way to escape from dependence on this class; it bypassed it, using foreigners, minorities, and, on the local level, the village *shaykhs*. The middle classes underwent a relative decline; but they survived, as is indicated by the fact that the regime never felt strong enough to "reform" al-Azhar. Al-Azhar, in turn, never felt so seriously threatened as to turn against the ruling power and to side with the people, as a number of *shaykhs* had done in the eighteenth century, when grievances were by no means as great. Numerous expressions of discontent among the '*ulamā*' were of course registered, but they apparently did not lead to any significant protest.

Numerous '*ulamā*', in fact, devoted themselves to writing conservative tracts in support of the government-sponsored *mawlid*s. One is driven to try to find some explanation for middle-class quietism in the vast wealth of the government coming from the sale of cotton. Students could be drawn to the new schools, and '*ulamā*' to the service of the regime, because of the large financial benefits involved. Thus, during the period of its peak, while the government could not transform the nature of the middle class, it could render its resistance harmless by buying off those whom it needed to neutralize. The policy of the regime toward the lower classes was far more brutal. Large-scale military ventures with high costs in human lives eliminated many of the enemies of the new order.

Hasan al-'Aṭṭār and the New Cultural Structure

Al-'Aṭṭār returned to Egypt in 1815 and quickly acquired renown in al-Azhar as a teacher. 'Alī Mubārak stated that other *shaykhs* left their teaching to attend his public lectures and that he was particularly noted for his lectures on the *Tafsīr al-Bayḍawī*. It is said that he astonished his audience by his method of presenting it.³⁰ The novelty which he represented (which was presumably an instant source of jealousy) was twofold. First was the method of teaching and second was the orientation which he gave to the subjects which he taught. Al-'Aṭṭār as a teacher was a continuation, probably quite self-consciously so, of al-Zabīdī. Al-Zabīdī had presented texts and the supportive chains of *ḥadīth* evidence in their totality, moving from the recounting of them (*riwāya*) to their analysis (*dirāya*). Al-Zabīdī taught without recourse to formal logic. Al-'Aṭṭār represented something of an advance in this respect in his application of formal logic in his teaching. His manner of presentation, given the composition of the student body and the orientation of the majority of the *shaykhs* toward the transmitted sciences, was brilliant but provocative. By the end of the 1820's, al-'Aṭṭār was doing his most serious teaching informally at home, feeling constrained in al-Azhar, where, for reasons which I have already alluded to, he had not influenced the dominant religious orientation.

Al-'Aṭṭār's public lectures were no doubt an important vehicle through

which he established his reputation. While no lists exist of those who studied with him, a number of students have given his name as one of their teachers. There were doubtless a great many such students, if the reports which 'Alī Mubārak received about his popularity as a teacher were correct. Among the names which have been located was Muḥammad al-Banānī al-Makkī, died 1831/1245. He became a Mālikī *muftī* in Mecca and was the author of a commentary on al-Bukhārī.³¹ Al-'Aṭṭār drew students from Syria as a consequence of his having taught there, and he drew Maghribī students because of his own ethnic background. One Syrian student was Sayyid Qāsim Daqqāq al-Duda, died 1845/1260. He studied with al-'Aṭṭār around 1827/1242 and subsequently wrote a work on *al-miqāt*.³² A second Syrian student who studied with al-'Aṭṭār shortly after his return to Egypt was Ḥusayn b. Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad al-Dimashqī al-Ḥanafī, died 1832/1247. He was a Ḥanafī *qāḍī* and spent a lifetime involved with different Ṣūfī orders, especially the Khalwatiya. He had been a disciple of Mustafā al-Bakrī al-Ṣiddīqī in his youth and later studied with a Khālifa of Aḥmad al-Sāwī, Shaykh Faṭhallah al-Mālikī.³³ Another student who studied with al-'Aṭṭār was also known for his involvement in Ṣūfī orders, Yūsuf Badr al-dīn, died 1863/1278. He was a member of the Qādiriya order and at the same time was a student, possibly a disciple, of the Shaykh Ṭariqat al-Shādhiliya, Bahā' al-dīn Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Yūsuf b. Aḥmad al-Bahī al-Murshidī. He also studied with two Egyptian Ṣūfis who were each Shaykh al-Azhar, al-Sharqāwī and al-Quwaysnī.³⁴

These students were the norm. They were drawn from the culture of *ḥadīth* and mysticism of the suppressed middle classes. For them, al-Azhar was a supportive environment which reinforced their social and religious outlook; and their contacts with al-'Aṭṭār did not alter this fact. In "withdrawing" to concentrate on teaching a handful of students at home, students whom he found receptive, al-'Aṭṭār accepted this reality. His move in the 1820's foreshadowed the creation of the new schools, such as the school of languages (1836). It was impossible to train students to serve the needs of the new regime in al-Azhar because of the political situation. The students themselves, well trained in rote memorization and possessed of high language ability, could develop quite differently if removed to a setting other than al-Azhar, especially if they came from families without strong ties to the old Cairene middle classes. This accounts in a general way for the number of new names in this period. Al-'Aṭṭār himself came from such a background, as did his principal students. After withdrawing to his home, al-'Aṭṭār gave his students two types of instruction. One was the intellectual framework of the elite for those who had the talent and inclination to serve in the new cultural structure. This included, for all students, rational theology; logic; appreciation of a conservative, contemplative mysticism; and philology. For his closest students, he included other fields, such as history, geography, and Islamic science and medicine, transmitting to them a vision of the unity and relevance of Islamic civilization based on very broad scholarly foundations. In addition, al-'Aṭṭār was able to introduce his

students to members of the ruling class. Al-ʿAṭṭār's period of activity, in which he trained and placed his students as Arabic literary editors (from the 1820's to his death in 1835), coincided with the peak years of development of the reform period. The institutions of the later 1830's came after the crest had been reached.

In the context of his tutorials, al-ʿAṭṭār continued his study of Andalusian literature.³⁵ He used this to enhance his reputation in the Maghrib, following the example of his teacher Muḥammad al-Amīr. Among the literary relationships through which al-ʿAṭṭār sustained his study of Andalusian literature during the 1820's was one with the secretary to the ruler Mulay Sulaymān Mālik al-Maghrib. His name was Abū Ḥamid al-ʿArabī b. Muḥammad al-Dumnātī al-Fāsī, died 1838/1253. Sometime before 1828, he made a trip to the Arab East and was a student of al-ʿAṭṭār while on his way to make the Pilgrimage, and their relationship continued after al-Dumnātī's return to Morocco.³⁶ "The great litterateur Sīdī al-ʿArabī al-Dumnātī al-Fāsī, the secretary to the Sultan of the Maghrib. He had sent me a copy of "Kitāb al-Rayḥānī" by Ibn al-Khaṭīb al-Andalusī and other books. He had come to our land as he was making the Ḥijj. There took place between us a number of discussions and correspondence."³⁷ He also included a letter from him in which he requested an *ijāza*. He praised al-ʿAṭṭār in his letter for his concern with the scholastic sciences. In al-ʿAṭṭār's reply, he mentioned having taught al-Dumnātī lessons from the text *Al-Shifāʾ* of the Qāḍī ʿIyād in theology, among others. When al-ʿAṭṭār wrote his *Ḥāshiya ʿalā sharḥ al-Khabaṣṣī* on logic, he apparently sent al-Dumnātī a copy and received ecstatic praise from him in prose and poetry.³⁸

Another focus of interest in classical Arabic literature also had a practical application which brought al-ʿAṭṭār into contact with some of the leading figures of the period. This was the prose genre of *al-inshāʾ*, or letter writing of an elegant type, which enjoyed a revival during this period among the bureaucratic elite.³⁹ Al-ʿAṭṭār dedicated his *Inshāʾ* to Muḥammad ʿAlī. He intended it to be of practical use to the ruling class as a guide for the secretaries and other bureaucrats of the new Jihādīya school, which he also praised. By 1827, the Bulāq Press, perhaps under al-ʿAṭṭār's influence, published a second *Inshāʾ*.⁴⁰ Al-ʿAṭṭār also taught *al-inshāʾ* to his students.⁴¹

Another figure with whom al-ʿAṭṭār came in contact as a result of his concern with language was a Turkish Şeyh ul-Islam, who was also a leading poet. Another was a leading bureaucrat in the government of Muḥammad ʿAlī. Both were interested in modernist reforms and at the same time in the neoclassical revival. Neither studied *ḥadīth*. The Ottoman Qadi to Egypt in the year 1823, and future Şeyh ul-Islam, was Arif Hikmet Bey, who played an important role in the cultural life of Turkey in the first half of the nineteenth century, as a poet and as Şeyh ul-Islam in Istanbul. He was born in 1786/1201 into a prominent family in Istanbul. His father, Ibrahim İsmet (died 1807), was a Naqshbandī Sūfī and the author of a number of books. Al-ʿAṭṭār may have met the family when he was in Istanbul, as Arif's father was well known at the time, although I have no evidence of this. Arif

began as *muftī* and ended as Şeyh ul-Islam (1845–1854). He was a close friend of Cevdet Pasha but at the same time a critic of certain aspects of Tanzimat education policy. He was a Naqshbandī Sūfī, a student, and a good friend of al-'Aṭṭār. Arif was also a poet, author of a well-known *Diwān*.⁴²

Another close friend of al-'Aṭṭār and a leading figure in cultural reform was Abderrahman Sami Pasha, scion of a wealthy Moreate. His father had been a Khalwatī *murshid* and he, like his son, had had a long relationship with Muḥammad 'Alī. Sami was born in 1795 and initiated into his mystical studies by his father along with another student and close friend, Mustafa Reshid, the future Tanzimat reformer. Sami left Morea in 1821 after the Greek uprisings, and returned during the campaign in 1824 as personal secretary to Ibrāhīm, son of Muḥammad 'Alī. Thereafter he was named to head *Al-Waqd'i' al-Miṣrīya* and then in 1831 to head the cabinet of Muḥammad 'Alī, with a promotion to brigadier-general. Sami Bey was also in touch with the Saint-Simonians, and they thought highly of him. (The Saint-Simonians, of course, were something of a mystical movement.) Sami's main writings were in the area of mysticism and *al-ḥikma*.⁴³

As a consequence of his friendship with Sami Bey, al-'Aṭṭār was favorably presented to Muḥammad 'Alī and received from him his two most important appointments, the editorship of the official gazette (*Al-Waqd'i' al-Miṣrīya*) and then, two years later, the position of Shaykh al-Azhar. What factors sustained the relationship between al-'Aṭṭār and Sami Bey and induced Sami Bey to help al-'Aṭṭār cannot be fully known without extensive archival research. However, literary sources are helpful in pointing to a shared intellectual outlook between the two writers, both of whom were interested in science, *al-ḥikma*, and progress à la the Muḥammad 'Alī regime. Al-'Aṭṭār, like Sami, wrote several books on *al-ḥikma* during the 1820's (see below). *Al-Waqd'i' al-Miṣrīya*, in fact, reflected the interest in an intellectualized mysticism on the part of Sami, al-'Aṭṭār, and Shihāb al-dīn.⁴⁴ The interests which they are known to have had in common make it difficult to sustain the general assumption that the Turkish version of the official gazette was conceived separately or that it was written first and the Arabic version merely followed it. There was, in fact, an underlying unity of outlook among the chief editors of both sections. In addition, most of them probably read Turkish and Arabic with ease. Thus the question of what influenced any particular piece of writing, be it in Turkish or in Arabic, is truly difficult to determine, although it deserves some attention.⁴⁵

The interests which al-'Aṭṭār shared with Sami Bey in *al-ḥikma*, a field which was devoted to questions of logic, natural science, and metaphysics, are further evidence that his close friends shared an intellectual orientation which differed markedly from that of the majority of his students at al-Azhar. Neoclassicism was the common basis. In sum, the writings of the reformer Sami Bey were philosophical and scientific; the writings of the reformer Arif Hikmet Bey, literary.

A study of al-'Aṭṭār's career in the 1820's as a teacher has indicated that

within al-Azhar he found himself in a situation of relative intellectual isolation. The main conclusion is that his efforts at social mobility within al-Azhar roused the antipathy of his colleagues, who were jealous of his qualifications and his outside connections. Al-'Aṭṭār's career in the 1820's brought him into increasing contact with other members of the ruling class. In al-'Aṭṭār's dedication of the *Inshā'* to Muḥammad 'Alī, he praised the latter as the righter of wrong, as being fearless, as having a mighty army, and so on.⁴⁶ Al-'Aṭṭār served, although probably briefly, as a tutor to Ibrāhīm.⁴⁷ The first manifestations of opposition to al-'Aṭṭār—although their origins are not always clear—date from the period when al-'Aṭṭār was being praised by the Europeans. The two facts, of course, are not unrelated. Matters came to a head after 1830 with his appointment as rector of al-Azhar, to which we now turn.

Al-'Aṭṭār was appointed on March 19, 1831/4 Shawwāl 1246, following the death of the previous Shaykh al-Azhar, Aḥmad al-Damahūjī. The choice was justified in the official release as if in anticipation of immediate opposition. One point mentioned was that Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār was appointed because Ḥasan al-Quwaysnī (another possible candidate for the post) would not accept the position due to his blindness. No particularly distinctive praise was made of al-'Aṭṭār's qualifications for the position; he was praised merely for his abilities in the rational and the transmitted sciences. The same had been said for his predecessor, who was in fact not distinguished at all. Al-'Aṭṭār's homosexuality was also commented on (*ḥālu ma'lūm*, his condition is known).⁴⁸ The role of the Shaykh al-Azhar during this period remains ill-defined. He was neither the *nāzir* of vast *awqāf*, as in the eighteenth century, nor a pre-eminent religious bureaucrat, as in the late nineteenth century. He was, as can be shown, involved in bureaucratic (especially administrative and judicial) matters, but these involvements cannot be assessed as long as the inner workings of the bureaucracy have not been properly studied.⁴⁹

Al-'Aṭṭār's conflict with Ḥasan al-Quwaysnī dated back at least to 1823. Their names are linked as far back as 1820. Al-Quwaysnī was a prominent member of the Bayyūmiya *ṭarīqa*. He was also Shaykh al-Riwāq of the blind, a group of poor men, estimated by Lane to have numbered about three hundred. In 1820, communal tensions reflecting the growing power of the foreign-based commercial sector were aired (although indirectly) in the complaint raised by one of the chief '*ulamā'*' of Alexandria, who questioned whether the Jewish butchers slaughtered animals in a manner acceptable to the Qur'ān. The matter could not be settled, and finally it was decided that it should be taken to Cairo, where Shaykh Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār and Ḥasan al-Quwaysnī, who were both known for their fairness, would decide the question. Both apparently agreed to dismiss the case.⁵⁰ In 1823, however, with the arrival of a potential patron, a personal dimension to their rivalry flared up when both al-'Aṭṭār and al-Quwaysnī taught Arif Hikmet Bey.

The really bitter antagonisms between al-'Aṭṭār and al-Quwaysnī, however, developed after al-'Aṭṭār became Shaykh al-Azhar. He was frequently

obstructed in his administrative duties. One example was the complaint that the editors and correctors whom he had appointed for the press did not work: they "exploited their talents in reading and writing!"⁵¹ Opposition to al-'Aṭṭār took a more extreme form later in the same year (1832), when a relative of Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār, a *shaykh* named Ibn al-Ḥusayn, was appointed Shaykh Riwāq al-Maghāribā. It seems reasonable to assume that he received the position with the support of al-'Aṭṭār. According to a not unprejudiced source compiled by a member of his family, a group of "plotters" told lies about al-Ḥusayn to Muḥammad 'Alī so that Muḥammad 'Alī ordered him exiled. Al-'Aṭṭār intervened on his behalf with Muḥammad 'Alī in order that the latter order an investigation. The plotting *shaykhs* convened in an official meeting place and when the investigator reported the complaint of al-'Aṭṭār, Shaykh al-Quwaysnī answered it by rejecting it; all the *shaykhs* present supported al-Quwaysnī's testimony, testifying falsely against al-'Aṭṭār. They thus maligned him so much that al-'Aṭṭār asked the council (*majlis*) to relieve him of the rectorship of al-Azhar, but the *majlis* refused. On another occasion while al-'Aṭṭār was rector, there was a meeting of the *shaykhs* at the Citadel to decide on certain matters. A number of them were dissatisfied with al-'Aṭṭār's view, so they stole his shoes; and one of them, Muṣṭafā al-'Arūsī, who was later to serve as rector of al-Azhar, told al-'Aṭṭār's donkey boy to go home, making him think that it was his master's order. When al-'Aṭṭār wanted to go home, he found himself obliged to go on foot in his stockings to his home in Darb al-Ḥammām. A third reported incident occurred after al-'Aṭṭār's death in 1835. Al-Quwaysnī, who succeeded al-'Aṭṭār as Shaykh al-Azhar, declared that the family of al-'Aṭṭār had no right to the personal effects of the late *shaykh*, because al-'Aṭṭār's son, Asad, was a minor and his mother was a slave. Shaykh al-Quwaysnī went to al-'Aṭṭār's home in Darb al-Ḥammām, taking with him a group of persons, and threatened the family, saying they would sell Asad's mother. Thereupon (and afterward on several occasions) they removed a number of books from al-'Aṭṭār's library, claiming that they had been willed (*mawqūf*) to the Riwāq al-Maghāribā. Of the books which they took on this pretence, some found their way to the *riwāq*, but the majority apparently went to personal libraries. Aḥmad al-Ḥusaynī registered a complaint with Muḥammad 'Alī to prevent further pillaging, but Muḥammad 'Alī at that time was in Alexandria; by the time he issued the decree forbidding '*ulamā*' to enter the house, much had already been lost. In his account, al-Ḥusaynī reported that he became personally convinced of the truth of this story when he found among the books in the Riwāq al-Maghāribā, *Kitāb al-umm*, vol. 1, in which there was an inscription, but not in al-'Aṭṭār's own handwriting. The inscription read, "This book of Shaykh Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār is a *waqf*, the place of which is the Riwāq al-Maghāribā." Al-Ḥusaynī observed that, apart from the matter of the handwriting, this was scarcely the style in which such dedications were usually written, as it was devoid of praise or elevated expressions. The writer failed to describe al-'Aṭṭār with any of the conventional honorific expressions, such as al-'Allāma, al-Fahāma, and so on,

thereby showing his dislike of al-ʿAṭṭār. Yet another incident related by al-Ḥusaynī involving Shaykh al-Quwaynī shows the latter's envy of al-ʿAṭṭār in the rational sciences. Al-Quwaynī, perhaps to show his own brilliance, set out to write a commentary on the *Sullam* in logic without, as he said, using any sources.⁵²

The structure of al-ʿAṭṭār's family is difficult to study from the few sources which we have; however, sometimes their scarcity and their silence on these points become topics in themselves. Al-ʿAṭṭār's mother never figured in the discussion of his youth; his "wife" at the pinnacle of his career was a slave. The imbalance in power between the sexes in this marriage must have been very exaggerated. In the eighteenth century, there had been a trend toward manumission of slaves among the middle classes. Is it not possible that al-ʿAṭṭār's continued acceptance of slavery had a bearing on the Aristotelianism for which he was so unusual among the *shaykhs* of his period? Obviously, his homosexuality also played an important role in his attitude toward women. In the only lengthy statement on women of his adult years, there is a scornful rejection of the *imāma* of women. In his rejection of this doctrine, al-ʿAṭṭār makes clear his concept of women as sex objects. It is significant that, whereas his teacher al-Zabīdī had had female students and went into extraordinary mourning on the death of a wife he adored, al-ʿAṭṭār with all his travels never is reported to have had women students. Finally, there is the anecdote recounted by one of al-ʿAṭṭār's Egyptian students of the day when kinsmen of his Turkish wife, a woman who was long since dead, arrived in Cairo, and there ensued a violent argument. If she was a woman of such importance that her kinsmen would come to visit al-ʿAṭṭār in Cairo, what a contrast she must have been to Asad's mother, and how badly al-ʿAṭṭār received this challenge from his deceased wife's family.

Al-ʿAṭṭār in fact suffered greatly during his last few years from the turmoil of bureaucratic in-fighting. In a remarkable piece written shortly before his death on the margin of a manuscript in the field of history belonging to his student al-Taḥṭāwī, he gave vent to his feelings. This short work took the form of his reflections on the life of a *shaykh* who lived in the tenth century in Damascus. This *shaykh*, having acquired wealth and respect in his life, withdrew from society and devoted himself to building gardens, growing flowers, and the creation of natural beauty. His works had a profound effect on his contemporaries who, according to his biographer, followed his lead and themselves turned to this worthwhile activity. Near the conclusion the historian said that when this man, whose name was Qāsim, died, "a piece of humanity died with him." Al-ʿAṭṭār wrote:

The historian said in his discussion "when he died"; he was in the tenth century, we are in the thirteenth century and no longer find a use for this expression. Because when people die, they are followed by voracious animals and attacking monsters. If we have relations with them, they will ravish them, they will ravish us; if we stay away from

them, they slander us. So we have no safety from them. Either we are with them or not with them. I say that may that time be praised which comes to me and makes pleasant the day so that I may sit alone in my chair away from these voracious monsters, who have no humanity in them, neither for this world nor for the one to come. . . . All in all, those whom God Almighty kept far removed from these people, they are the blessed ones, praiseworthy are their lives. Yes, yes, yes, indeed!

I wish that I myself could withdraw and refuse entirely to see mankind, as if I were on top of some tall mountain. For when I became Shaykh al-Azhar, toward the end of my life, I forgot even the scholarship in which I had spent my life, until my eyes finally grew weak. And [when I became] Shaykh al-Azhar, my relations with people were such that they prevented anything worthwhile in either my religious or my secular life. I do not see anything but enemies wearing the clothes of friends. [I see] only arrogant, wily, malicious tricksters who are laying traps for me . . . and my destruction stares me in the eye. O! my God, protect me from those who want to injure me, and stand between them and me. O! my God, with whom I communicate through your beloved Muṣṭafā and his family, save me from their treachery. For I sense that many of those who smile at me would never hesitate if they were given the chance to drink my blood. God is my guardian; for indeed, before I entered this position, I had not known that there were human beings like these. May God protect me from them. [signed, Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār] ⁵³

European contemporaries who were involved in setting up the new institutions praised al-ʿAṭṭār highly, especially in the field of medicine, in which he had worked for many years.⁵⁴ Al-ʿAṭṭār's support for the founding of the school of human medicine and his praise for Clot Bey are indicated in his address to the graduating class of the Abū Zaʿbal medical school in 1832.⁵⁵ Edward Lane, who was interested in philology and literature, knew al-ʿAṭṭār. He singled al-ʿAṭṭār's *Inshāʾ* out from his other writings for praise.⁵⁶

It would certainly seem that for al-ʿAṭṭār, who was still rooted in Maghribī circles, the creation of the new social class linked to Europe, with the concomitant suppression of the old commercial middle class, was a very painful and trying event in which to participate. For the younger generation, and notably his students, we find no evidence suggesting such a degree of inner turmoil. Most of them were still children during the time of most rapid social change, and they grew up to accept the system which rewarded them. By the 1830's, al-Azhar had, in fact, declined as an intellectual center, and the new schools were gaining prominence. For those with a literary or philological orientation, the position of corrector or editor was a rewarding, if intellectually strenuous, one, very different, of course, from the role of the eighteenth-century poet or litterateur.

How students found their way into the new cultural infrastructure, especially before the creation of the School of Languages in 1835, depended

much on their luck in securing patronage, which may explain why most of the main scholars discussed came through al-Azhar and were helped by Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār. In 1836, al-ʿAṭṭār's most famous student took over the direction of the newly created School of Languages, in which Frenchmen taught French and *shaykhs* of al-Azhar taught Arabic. The seventy-odd graduates in the first decade of its existence came to be among the most prominent cultural figures of the age of Ismaʿīl. This was ultimately a consequence of the rivalry between England and France over Egyptian cotton. We turn now to an examination of the religious framework of secular culture in the reform period, saving for the two last chapters a detailed study of the developments in the arts and sciences.

Chapter 7

The Revival of Theology and *Kalām*: Hallmarks of the Culture of the State Commercial Sector

This chapter develops the idea proposed earlier that the '*ulamā*' served the modernizing state in Turkey and Egypt by adjusting and adapting the received cultural and religious forms. In particular, the '*ulamā*' turned to Māturīdite theology and other rational sciences which shared a common link to the Aristotelian framework developed under conditions of agrarian feudalism. The task which the '*ulamā*' performed—providing a justification for the policies of the state and defending the state against its enemies—was a traditional task. What makes their activities worthy of note is that they were functioning under modern conditions in the nineteenth century. It is this fact which gives their reintroduction of traditional logic and other subjects a new meaning, a meaning which can only be understood against the backdrop of the modern world market. We do not find the static, antinomic rationalism of the medieval logicians, such as the Mu'tazilī or St. Anselme, who flourished in the settled conditions of a feudal society. Nor is this the rigorous self-contained rationalism of a Descartes reflecting an organic capitalist development impossible except at the center of the world market. One thinks more of Kant, whose thought was rooted in the culture of a semiperipheral region, who combined some of the medieval elements, like antinomies of faith and reason, with his modernist critique of pure reason.

Māturīdism in Egypt is even more eclectic. The precapitalist division of labor clearly affects the level of conceptualization, and this accounts for the retention of the Aristotelian framework; but the uses to which the conceptual framework is put, most notably the exaggerated dependence on arguments by analogy, suggests the new reality of a capitalist mode of distribution which was emerging, notably in its utilitarianist orientation.

I shall pursue the study of Māturīdism in Egypt through the writings of the two principal spokesmen for the reform period, al-'Aṭṭār and his student al-Ṭaḥṭāwī. In al-'Aṭṭār's writings, a Māturīdite theology becomes uncomfortably linked with the study of formal logic and argumentation. Theology was no longer susceptible to a pure logical treatment. Al-'Aṭṭār was not concerned with questions of the limit of reason so much as its plasticity.

Once reborn, the study of logic, like the analogous study of disciplines ancillary to the study of *hadīth* in the eighteenth century, took on a life of its own. It opened the way to a study of physical medicine and the natural

sciences, and to a challenge of other fields, such as *al-ḥikma*, which had been part of the eighteenth-century revival. The religious revival in this way resembled the first phase, 1760–1815, in that it exploited a single religious modality: the general development of culture flowing out of it. That the pressures imposed by the market distorted both the balance of religious culture and the course of cultural development should by this time come as no surprise.

To locate the characteristic problems of the age and the way in which they were resolved, I return to the corpus of religious writing. One is immediately struck by the quantity of polemical material which this age produced, both in Turkey and in Egypt, and by the particular concern in the textbooks of logic for the topic of analogy (*qiyās*). While the rebirth of *kalām* explains in a general way the study of the structure of logical argument, it does not clarify the reasons for the great concentration on argument by analogy. I pause here briefly to recapitulate some of what has been said previously. This concentration on analogy was no doubt related to the intellectual drive on the part of the ruling class to understand and adapt numerous aspects of Western science and technology. It is generally accepted that Western science and technology of the early industrial revolution had encouraged an extremely empiricist outlook and that the new classes it produced reflected very little of the classical education of "Oxbridge," an education which, as did the Azharite education, stressed the Aristotelian corpus. However, our concern here is more properly with the modernizing elite on the periphery of the industrial revolution and not with the classes in its heartland. On the periphery, the historical situation was different. The intellectual task of the ruling classes on the periphery was the reception of blueprints which had already been constructed, and the adaptation of these blueprints to local conditions. This situation encouraged neither the empiricism of pure scientific research nor technological development. It encouraged, of necessity, a more deductive approach; argument through analogy was perhaps the method through which existing problems could best be confronted. In the nineteenth century, it will be shown, the students who revived Aristotelian logic were those who supported modern Western science, especially in the period 1815–1837.

It would seem that the arguments used by the higher '*ulamā*' of Turkey who supported the Tanzimat and an analogous although much smaller group in Egypt drew on the logical tradition of India, the stronghold of later Sunnī rationalism, when they needed to use *kalām* as a vehicle of "ideological" defense. The Indian intellectual traditions were already well known, especially in Turkey and Syria, as a consequence of the spreading popularity of the Naqshbandis and their offshoots. In Turkey, polemics centered around the orthopraxy urged by the *Tarīqa Muhammadiya*. In Syria and Turkey, the differences between Māturidite and Ash'arite theology were disputed—the Naqshbandis and the members of the elite supported the former. In Egypt, *kalām* was used as a weapon against the pretensions of

the Ahl al-Ḥadīth. Sunnī orthodoxy, allying itself with modern science, attacked the overreaching claims of *al-ḥikma*, on the one hand, and mystical theology, on the other. In both Turkey and Egypt, al-ʿAṭṭār was a participant in these conflicts, and he always sided with the ruling class. He was the pre-eminent *mutakallim* of the reform period in Egypt; for this he had had a long period of preparation in Syria and Turkey. In his writings which will be studied here and in the following chapters, the major trends of this important, if short-lived, Aristotelian revival in theology, logic, medicine, and science, are pursued.

Al-ʿAṭṭār and the Theology of the Religious Elite

The Period of Development

If one is to pursue al-ʿAṭṭār's involvement in religious polemic, which inevitably embraces both his studies of logic and theology and the controversies themselves, a schematic overview of his development in *kalām* is necessary. His first phase, as an Ashʿarite, ended early in his stay in Turkey. Thereafter, his study of logic and other rational science drew him toward a Māturīdite position. The most "radical" position which he reached came during the 1830's, when he wrote on *ijtihād* from a Māturīdite outlook.

During his youth, Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār had studied a number of basic theological texts with the well-known teachers of his period: two teachers in particular are mentioned, al-Sharqāwī and al-Disūqī.¹ Al-ʿAṭṭār studied theology with ʿAbdullah al-Sharqāwī,² receiving two special diplomas and a general diploma on the remainder of his teacher's books. He studied logic and theology with the Mālikī Muḥammad al-Disūqī, who was a *faqīh*, and received an *ijāza* from him, later teaching his work on credo (*ʿaqīda*), "*Ḥāshiyat al-Disūqī ʿalā sharḥ al-Sānūsī ʿalā muqadimmat umm al-barāhīn*." His theological education continued in Turkey. Details are lacking, for al-ʿAṭṭār merely mentions that he "studied with many of the famous teachers of Turkey."³

Al-ʿAṭṭār's first essay and his only Ashʿarite work was the "*Tuḥfat gharīb al-waṭan*," an attack on the Ṭarīqa Muḥammadiya. "*Al-Ṭarīqa al-muḥammadiya*" was the title of a book written by Pīr Birkāwī (Birghili Mehmet Efendi), died 1573/981. It also referred to a distinct theological tendency within orthodox Sunnism, focusing on the importance of orthopraxy. The continuous existence of the Ṭarīqa Muḥammadiya over more than three hundred years suggests that its followers—and these were numerous—may have represented a particular social force as well.⁴ Europeans in contact with the Orient during the seventeenth, eighteenth, and early nineteenth centuries were quite familiar with the Ṭarīqa Muḥammadiya, many regarded it as the "true Islam." In the period of al-ʿAṭṭār's life, spokesmen for the movement had written a number of books supporting it, thereby

attesting to its continued vitality. While it is difficult to determine from scant evidence exactly what it represented in social terms, the points most often made about its strong feelings about coined money and that it did not initially attract the common people seem clear enough.

The sector of society which was most affected by the inflation of the sixteenth century and thereafter was the Turkish merchant community, or those segments of it who confronted the growing entrenchment of the minorities as the dominant commercial class, and those affected by the concomitant erosion of the guild economy. Landholders united with foreign traders were turning Turkey into an exporter of raw materials. One would expect certain ideological convulsions to take place among the merchants who were threatened economically by the new commercial nexus with Europe. As the essay of al-'Aṭṭār on the *Tarīqa Muḥammadiya* has not been located, we are left with his own brief description of it as a defense of the Ash'arite doctrine of *kasb* against certain deterministic (*jabrīya*) ideas of Khadimi-Zadeh.⁶

The Beginning of al-'Aṭṭār's Māturīdite Period

The most important break in al-'Aṭṭār's thought coincides with his study of rational sciences in Istanbul. It was in Istanbul and Alexandretta that he read widely on medicine, science, logic, and argumentation. These were translated shortly thereafter into religious categories in his subsequent theological essays. The latter took up a range of topics which confronted him in Damascus and later in Cairo. Damascus was the probable point of crystallization.⁷

Al-'Aṭṭār wrote several essays while on his travels, of which two remain. These deal with natural science and man's freedom. In them he offered a Māturīdite justification for his positions in these fields. One was written in 1813/1228 while he was in Syria and was entitled "Hadhā jawāb shaykh Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār 'an su'āl Muṣṭafā al-Bidiri." The essay set out to deal with the point of view of the reformist concerning the Ṭabī'iyīn (natural scientists) and especially the idea of the latter that the creator of events is nature, with respect to the idea of the ancients that health could be regulated through a regulation of the humours. Al-'Aṭṭār began by following the Aristotelian physics and Galenic medicine in explaining these views. This included a discussion (folio 12) of several naturalistic ideas of causation, including, surprisingly, the writings of 'Abd al-Laṭīf al-Baghdādī on the *Qānūnī* (see below under medicine). Al-'Aṭṭār concluded his answer to the question on natural scientists by stating (especially on folio 14B) that they were not wrong for being scientists but that they did not adduce a proper account of causation. Al-'Aṭṭār then referred his readers (folio 16B) to his own work on Dā'ūd al-Antākī, reconciling the Greek and theistic systems by stating that in the end God is the first influence or mover. In

the conclusion of the essay, he offered a linguistic explanation for the causes of misunderstanding in religion. It is necessary, he said, that discussion be confined to correct technical usages and correct principles.

In another work written during this period, entitled "Risālat al-ʿAṭṭār fi khalq al-afʿāl fi ʿilm al-kalām," al-ʿAṭṭār took up the question of the createdness of man's acts.⁸ In a third essay linked in part to his studies in the natural sciences, al-ʿAṭṭār discussed the question of whether or not the world was eternal or created.⁹ In this and other works, he took a view sympathetic to the natural sciences, defending the study of these fields while rejecting the point at issue. He himself required this shield in order to write his own works on *al-handasa* (geometry, with topics in astronomy and engineering). The fact that one of the commentators in a section on geometry had Shīʿī leanings, and that that could be used against him, led al-ʿAṭṭār to argue that the commentator, Nāṣir al-dīn al-Ṭūsī, did not write the "objectionable" parts of a book, "Al-Tajrid," as alleged.¹⁰

Al-ʿAṭṭār's return to Egypt, especially the period immediately after his arrival, provides additional evidence of the development of his Māturidite doctrinal outlook. This period should be included here, since it is logically separate from his subsequent entrance into the new institutional structure. When al-ʿAṭṭār returned to Egypt, he made an immediate reputation by teaching the "Ṭawālī" of al-Bayḍāwī and the writings of al-Bayḍāwī's student in *kalām*, al-Ījī.¹¹ Mubārak stated that the "Ṭawālī" was a work which no one had read (i.e., taught) before. While this is not true, it is true that the approach to theology through *kalām* was relatively unknown.¹² Al-ʿAṭṭār's presentation stressed analysis and logic over accumulated knowledge of individual points. We have some idea of his main points because they were incorporated in later writings. On essential points of doctrine, al-ʿAṭṭār sought to define the terms so that some degree of judgment was incumbent upon the believer. For example, in his discussion of ritual impurity (*al-najāsa*), al-ʿAṭṭār stressed the importance of the taste, color, and smell of the water as against the more static notion embodied in the definition of cleanliness as dependent on a fixed quantity of water.¹³

To conclude, al-ʿAṭṭār's conversion to Māturidism dated from his contact with the Turkish ruling class. In a series of essays reflecting this experience, he began to attempt to find arguments for modern science from within *kalām*.

Al-ʿAṭṭār in Egypt

The entrance of al-ʿAṭṭār to a position of authority within the cultural elite at a time when modern class structure was undermining the independence of the corporate institutions of the Middle Ages explains many of the difficulties which confronted him. This theme has already been pursued on the level of biography; I turn now to a discussion of his later writings, in which there appeared the problems of defending in traditional intellectual cate-

gories a regime which no longer could be fully understood through them. Of these later writings, one has been referred to many times, the gloss on the *Ĵami' al-jawāmi'*. The second is an unknown manuscript on *ijtihād*, which is likewise of great importance for what it reveals about the transformation of thought.

As both these works are on the science of the roots of jurisprudence, *uṣūl al-fiqh*, I shall briefly discuss this subject. Al-'Aṭṭār did not write extensively on *tafsīr*. His one independent work on *ḥadīth*, or more properly on *muṣṭalaḥ al-ḥadīth*, has not been located, but his views on certain matters in the *sunna* appear in the main work on *uṣūl al-fiqh*. This work also contains a large section on *qiyās*, which is much the same as his several texts on logic (which will be treated below). This leaves his essay on *ijtihād* and a similar but shorter work by his student al-Ṭaḥṭāwī, also on *ijtihād*. Thus, I concentrate here on *sunna* and *ijtihād*, studying them for the moment in isolation. I begin with al-'Aṭṭār's discussion of the role of *ḥadīth* in religious thought. In the context in which he wrote in 1830, it can be taken as a manifestation of the emerging class conflict.

One topic which was particularly important to the *ḥadīth* movement was that of the *ṣaḥāba*. A concern with the *ṣaḥāba* may be said to have pervaded the circles of the Sādāt al-Wafā'īya, but its influence was much wider. Al-'Aṭṭār rejected the claim that the *ṣaḥāba* were a category of human beings possessed of some special virtue. In so doing, he was of course raising doubts about the validity of eighteenth-century *ḥadīth* study, which dealt heavily with questions of their spiritual status. In another discussion, al-'Aṭṭār raised the question of how the *ṣaḥāba* were to be defined, a question dealt with only implicitly in the writings of the eighteenth century. He referred to a commentary by al-Māzrī which stated that the most important criterion in identifying the *ṣaḥāba* was whether they attended the sessions of the Prophet as a way of manifesting their adherence to him. Another condition which al-'Aṭṭār mentioned had been laid down by Sa'īd al-Muṣīb, who said that one could not be among the *ṣaḥāba* unless one had gone on a *ghazwa* (raid) with the Prophet. Al-'Aṭṭār preferred the first definition over the second because the second would have eliminated several well-known Companions, for example, Jarīr b. 'Abdullah al-Balī.¹⁴

Al-'Aṭṭār never took seriously the important eighteenth-century contention of the merit of visiting the tombs of the *ṣaḥāba*. He denied that either visitation or knowledge of the special virtue of each individual member of the *ṣaḥāba* had the slightest religious efficacy. He also raised the question of whether the *ṣaḥāba* were accurate in their narration. Al-'Aṭṭār concluded that the *ṣaḥāba* were all accurate, deducing that all those who have subsequently done research have been content to note whether a *ḥadīth* was *mursal* or not, that is, whether the chain of authorities for a given report went back at least until the second generation. He did caution, however, that one must discount the stories of those who saw the Prophet as babies, such as Hasan, Husayn, and 'Abdullah b. Zubayr. Al-'Aṭṭār then quoted the opinion of one of the main figures in *kalām*, the Imām al-

Haramayn, who said that we do not examine the reliability of the Companions because they transmitted the Shari'a. If it were agreed to permit inquiry over their accuracy, then the Shari'a might have to be limited to the generation of the Prophet. But al-'Atṭār was not entirely satisfied with such medieval logic. He returned to al-Māzrī, who stated that not all those who greeted the Prophet once, or visited him, or met him, should be included; but rather, those who had attached themselves to him, whose pride had been subdued by him, who were victorious with him, were likely to be accurate in their narratives. Al-'Alā'ī said that al-Māzrī's claim concerning the accuracy of their narration is strange, since many of the famous Companions were known to have been inaccurate, for example, Wā'il b. Ḥajar, Mālik b. Huwarith, 'Uthmān b. Abī al-'Āṣī, and others. Some stayed with him only a short time, others could report only a single *ḥadīth*. For others, the length of their stays among the Arab tribes could not be determined. The majority of the *muḥaddithīn* who spoke of the *ṣaḥāba* referred to those who could speak with understanding.¹⁵

Al-'Atṭār's statements on the *ṣaḥāba* are also interesting for the psychological analysis presented above. By rejecting the claim of the *ṣaḥāba* in favor of the claims of the *mutakallimīn*, al-'Atṭār was eliminating the role of women as a voice of authority. When al-'Atṭār rejected the criterion of *ghazwa*, it was to defend the reputation of a man and not 'Ā'isha or some other woman. The defining of a trustworthy knowledge of Muḥammad in terms of whether or not one had attended sessions with him runs against the spirit of authenticity of the eighteenth century. Women had played an important and well-known role in the life of Muḥammad. Is it a coincidence that al-'Atṭār does not write about Muḥammad? Muḥammad's life was a matter of fascination to the writers of the eighteenth century, even to al-'Atṭār's student Ibrāhīm al-Saqqā', who wrote on Muḥammad's wives, and, of course, to his student al-Ṭaḥṭāwī.

Ijtihād: Background

Ijtihād, or the theological imperative to exercise disciplined self-judgment according to certain specified conditions, the last pillar of *uṣūl al-fiqh*, has throughout Islamic history been one of the most important vehicles for inspiring and ratifying social changes. In writings on Egypt, a great deal of attention has been paid to the essay on *ijtihād* by Shaykh Muḥammad 'Abdu, which was written late in the nineteenth century. It has been generally claimed that he wrote this as a consequence of his association with Jamāl al-dīn al-Afghānī. However, no wider study of *ijtihād* in the Egyptian context has been undertaken, no inquiry into the later development of *uṣūl al-fiqh* has been made, despite the widely recognized participation of certain *shaykhs* in the reform activities of the era of Muḥammad 'Alī and afterward.

A brief survey of existing books and manuscripts indicates that the revival

al of the Māturīdite theology among the Naqshbandīs in India in the context of severe social conflicts and the subsequent spread of the order to Turkey and the Arab world in the eighteenth century is generally a more suitable point of departure for the study of *uṣūl al-fiqh* in modern history than Muḥammad 'Abdu. The writings on *ijtihād* by Shāh Walī'ullah were in fact read and quoted by Egyptian writers, beginning in the eighteenth century, and this continued to be the case into the nineteenth century, as a revived concern with *uṣūl al-fiqh*, especially *sunna*, penetrated Egypt through al-Zabīdī and others. For example, Muḥammad al-Ṣabbān and 'Abdullah al-Sharqāwī wrote on *uṣūl al-fiqh*. Al-Ṣabbān wrote on a section of the *Jamī' al-jawāmi'* of Imām al-Subkī, although for this generation the focus within *uṣūl* was *ḥadīth* not *fiqh*.¹⁶

An analysis of the *mujtahidīn* who wrote prior to Muḥammad 'Abdu and of their writings on *ijtihād* presents not only problems of new and undigested material but problems of method as well. It would seem, in considering the new material, that those claiming the right to *ijtihād* may not in fact have been more radical in the content of their thought than those who opposed or attempted to limit *ijtihād*. This can be determined only through a study of their historical circumstances. The same would seem to apply in reverse to those traditionalists who adhered to *taqlīd*.

The *mujtahidīn* of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries lived during the initial impact of the Western industrial revolution on their societies. Among the most visible signs of the period were governmental dependence on foreigners and the opposition of local courts to Muslim merchants. Shāh Walī'ullah, a *mujtahid* of India and a major figure in the Naqshbandī Māturīdī reform movement of which I have written, wrote as a defender of the Indian Muslim merchants. The Imām al-Sānūsī, another *mujtahid*, wrote from a situation in North Africa in which the coastal beys were becoming satellites of the Europeans, and then using their newly gained power to try to dominate the commercial economy of the hinterlands.

In Shāh Walī'ullah's "*Iqd al-jd fi ahkām al-ijtihād wa'l-taqlīd*," *ijtihād* was presented as a utilitarian and inescapable part of *iftā'*, the issuing of legal opinions. The real source of contention in law came not from *mujtahidīn* reaching divergent conclusions but from a persistent clinging to generalities (to universals).¹⁷ In a second work, the *Hujja*, Shāh Walī'ullah explicitly dealt with the plight of merchants. In contrast to the utilitarian *ijtihād* of Shāh Walī'ullah was the more eclectic yet more dogmatic *ijtihād* of Imām al-Sānūsī. Utilitarianism, an avoidance of extremes and universal pronouncements, was the logic of the merchant. It could function securely within the confines of a *madhhab* and had merely to struggle with the pretensions of *kalām* to systematization. Imām al-Sānūsī, who came from the hinterlands and nomad regions, did not impose the necessity that one follow a particular *madhhab*; rather, he argued, one could choose a ruling from what was most advantageous.

It was the challenge of Imām al-Sānūsī's arrival in Egypt and his contact

with Azhar *shaykhs* which inspired several Azharite writings on the subject of *ijtihād*. I shall follow this controversy closely, as it led to important clarifications of thought in Egypt. When al-Sānūsī arrived in Egypt around 1830, he accused the *shaykhs* of al-Azhar of being indifferent to learning and of being overly attached to Muḥammad 'Alī. Concerning the exact nature of his relations with the *shaykhs* of al-Azhar, there is relatively little information. According to one account, al-Sānūsī studied with Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār and took an *ijāza* from him as well as from some other Azharites. Another account stated that he merely met with al-'Aṭṭār and discussed various matters with him.¹⁸

Other ambiguities center around his most bitter opponent in the Azhar, Shaykh Hanish, whose motives do not clearly come to light; in addition, it is difficult to tell if the *fatwa* (legal opinion) attacking al-Sānūsī issued by the Mufti of the Mālikīs, al-Bulāqī, was actually issued while al-Sānūsī was there or later.¹⁹ Furthermore, it is difficult to determine which work of al-Sānūsī was being answered by al-'Aṭṭār and al-Bulāqī. Many of the points in al-'Aṭṭār's essay appear to be replies to a short essay for which, however, there is no date of original composition.²⁰

Al-Sānūsī affirmed that, where matters of law were not clearly resolved by earlier thinkers, judges and *muftis* had a certain latitude. The main condition which al-Sānūsī laid down was that the opinion given must be grounded in both the Qur'ān and *sunna*. If he so bases his opinion, the *mujtahid* does not err. An additional implication was that, if he finds his opinion in agreement with aspects of *taqlīd*, he is not bound to follow that Imām in other respects. Here Shāh Walī'ullah was more radical, for al-Sānūsī claimed that this did not constitute *taqlīd*. But in other respects, his ideas were similar to those of Shāh Walī'ullah, at least in method. For example, Imām al-Sānūsī asserted the following traditional views: *taqlīd* was contrary to the Qur'ān (the view of Ibn Taymīya), but unlike most *mujtahids*, al-Sānūsī denied that it was necessary to accept one of the four rites even as a point of departure; rather, people were free to seek opinions (hence *ḥadīthi*) wherever they were to be found.²¹

The most reasonable hypothesis to explain the extreme opposition of certain *shaykhs* to al-Sānūsī is that the appeal of the latter in Egypt was to groups which were not sympathetic to the Muḥammad 'Alī regime. This explains why two leading persons, identified with the regime, a Shaykh al-Azhar and a Mufti, should attack him. Since al-Bulāqī and al-'Aṭṭār were not opponents of Ṣūfism, not opponents in any sense of the radical innovations of the regime, their intense opposition to al-Sānūsī goes beyond methodology and must therefore be attributed to their circumstances.²² Evidence on these points is very limited, however. One of the charges which al-Bulāqī made, if true, is suggestive: he referred to the majority of the partisans of the *shaykhs* as from the wealthy materialistic class of this world.²³ From this it may be surmised that al-Sānūsī, whose basis was among the merchants and tribesmen of the North African hinterland, might have been trying to win converts among Egyptian merchants and tribesmen. Did al-

Sānūsī try to picture Muḥammad 'Alī as a deity, allied to a Christian power?

Al-'Aṭṭār's unknown essay, in addition to being an attack on al-Sānūsī, is the first independent essay on *ijtihād* in Egypt in the nineteenth century.²⁴ Al-'Aṭṭār organized his essay as a rejoinder to a question put to him by an African named Muḥammad Ibn Abī Sa'īd al-Kirkāstī al-Ṣanāwī, who was said to have been born in al-Shindī and to reside in al-Shākī. The principal question was whether *taqlīd* is incumbent on the believer, or in what sense does *ijtihād* exist.

Al-'Aṭṭār's defense of *ijtihād* within the *madhhab* is clearly a *mutakallim*'s defense of the mosque center against the claims of an outsider. *Ijtihād*, he insisted, implied an institutional basis. More significant than the degrees of *ijtihād* was perhaps the reassertion in *uṣūl al-fiqh* of the conflict between Ahl al-Kalām and Ahl al-Ḥadīth. Al-Sānūsī claimed that he performed *ijtihād* on the basis of familiarity with the Qur'ān and *sunna*. Al-'Aṭṭār showed that a knowledge of the obvious analogy, a part of *kalām*, was also necessary.²⁵ A further clue to the essentially polemical nature of the distinctions can be found through comparison to yet another work discussing *ijtihād* by the leading Mālikī jurist of the eighteenth century and one of the principal teachers of al-'Aṭṭār. In a well-known text, Muḥammad al-Amīr wrote of the *mujtahid* not in terms of his mastery of the mechanism of *ijtihād* but in terms of his divine inspiration "which permitted him at the same time to act in the eyes of his contemporaries as one who followed the Sharī'a."²⁶

Finally, there is strong evidence provided in al-'Aṭṭār's essay of its polemical nature by the frequent recourse to personal invective. He insulted al-Sānūsī in terms of his origins and in terms of the low state of learning in Tripolitania (!?), of which he alleged that al-Sānūsī was a product.²⁷ He indicated that al-Sānūsī's claim to be a *mujtahid* was based on his mistaken belief that any man with understanding could use the Qur'ān and *ḥadīth*, a conclusion in contradiction to the "corpus of Mālikī learning."²⁸ Later a similar approach to *ijtihād* was worked out by al-'Aṭṭār's student al-Taḥṭāwī in his essay "Al-Qawl al-sadīd fī'l-ijtihād wa'l-taqlīd."²⁹ Although there are some points which are not found in al-'Aṭṭār's essay, the basic concept of the *madhhab*, of the law school as a living chain leading back to one of the four great Imāms, was the same. Within each of the four orthodox schools of law, a hierarchy of different degrees of *ijtihād* within the *madhhab* was established, and here al-Taḥṭāwī repeats a number of traditional details. He stated, for example, that before the Imām al-Shāfi'ī came, the students of *ḥadīth* were on weak ground vis-à-vis the adherents of *al-ra'y* (self-judgment not based on the Qur'ān or *sunna*) because they lacked the skills of argumentation, but that the Imām al-Shāfi'ī had put *ḥadīth* studies on a firmer basis. Concerning *ijmā'*, or consensus, as a method of resolving jurisprudential impasses, al-Taḥṭāwī, as did al-'Aṭṭār, related it to the *ijmā'* of the four Imāms. Then, following al-'Aṭṭār, he argued that in matters concerning *ijtihād* the Zāhirīs, a fifth school of law which flourished in medieval times, had little to contribute. What was new was a section on the valid

reasons for changing one's *madhhab*. Al-Taḥṭāwī stressed that the only valid reasons were religious and not material ones, such as might be related to employment.³⁰

An aspect of the debate on *ijtihād* and *taqlīd* between al-'Aṭṭār and al-Sānūsī revolved around a series of technical matters which shed further light on their respective concepts of *ijtihād* and more generally on their respective situations. Al-Sānūsī contested the need for prayer during a trip involving the stay of less than four days in a single place and likewise contested the need to fast in Ramaḍān during a voyage. Al-'Aṭṭār dealt with the subject (on folio 66 of his essay on *ijtihād*) in utilitarian terms, relating the conditions in which prayer might be shortened to the question of the actual length of travel. He was able to find justification for his interpretation from al-Bukhārī and Ibn 'Abbās. Al-'Aṭṭār dealt similarly with other modifications which al-Sānūsī permitted. While al-Bulāqī merely observed that, for example, the prolongation of the *rak'a* (bending of the torso in prayer) was contrary to Mālikī practice, al-'Aṭṭār spoke of the violation of the symmetric shape of prayer. Al-'Aṭṭār also dealt with another point which al-Bulāqī did not, namely, the cutting of the lotus tree. The lotus tree had a special place in Islam, and it was mentioned in the Qur'ān, where it is stated that washing with lotus leaves is more beneficial than anything else for the head, that it drives away scurf. The Prophet Muḥammad mentioned using it with regard to the washing of the dead.³¹ Al-'Aṭṭār cited a *ḥadīth* (on folio 68) that "whoever cut down a lotus tree, God will strike his head with fire." He then proceeded to explain the intention which underlay this saying. He stated that these trees tended to grow in the desert and that they were a great boon to wayfarers. In this way, the prohibition against cutting down the lotus is similar to the prohibition against cutting the trees of al-Ḥaramayn, Mecca and Madīna. Al-'Aṭṭār concluded his argument, based on geography, by accusing al-Sānūsī (folio 71) of being ignorant of the writings of the *mutakallimīn* on such points. Al-'Aṭṭār took up yet another point of al-Sānūsī's argument which did not appear in al-Bulāqī's work, the pollution of ritual water (*al-najāsa*). Again, al-'Aṭṭār's approach attempted a balance, and he dismissed al-Sānūsī's view by accusing him of misuse of *ḥadīth* sources.³²

Al-'Aṭṭār opposed al-Sānūsī's support of the *imāmate* of women, citing a saying by Muḥammad "that no people will succeed if their affairs are ruled over by women." He further stated that women lack intellect and religion compared with men. Finally, in a rare note of levity, he added that if a woman were the *imām*, and stood in front of the men in prayer, when she made the *rak'as* and kneeled, the thoughts of the males would stray and they would be overcome with lust (such is human nature), and thus the humbling of oneself in the face of God would be impossible. Another point which al-'Aṭṭār raised against al-Sānūsī concerned the nature of God's light. Al-Sānūsī had apparently based his arguments on *ahādīth* of which al-'Aṭṭār did not approve. Al-'Aṭṭār began by stating that *ḥadīth* could be used

only if handled in a scientific manner, which meant that only those which had been properly preserved should necessarily be accepted. To claim (as al-Sānūsī did?) that God was the best of saints, and that the other saints were created by His divine spark, was a Karmathian doctrine. Al-'Aṭṭār concluded the essay by stating that, while the danger exists that the mob (the hangers-on around the mosque) will follow anyone, in any case (folio 8r) al-Sānūsī was destined to go to Hell. Al-Bulāqī offered a slightly different view, which has been cited above, that al-Sānūsī appealed to the wealthy and the "materialists."³³

While not enough is given in al-'Aṭṭār's résumé of al-Sānūsī's ideas, nor is the identification of that text certain enough to know what the differences between the two were on every point, the topics raised—such as travel and the proper organization of prayer, the sex of the *imām*, the cutting of the lotus tree, and the problem of securing ritual water—all seem to be topics of practical concern to the traveling merchants of the caravan who had to fulfill their religious obligations as best they could in whatever circumstances they found themselves. Al-'Aṭṭār's disagreement with al-Sānūsī over these points reflected the position of the *mutakallim* in an urban scholastic center, as well as the position of a *mutakallim* in the secure material environment of Cairo. Al-'Aṭṭār could afford to dismiss al-Sānūsī, to "refute" al-Sānūsī by claiming that it was an impossibility that he could be a *mujtahid*.

Ahl al-Kalām and Mysticism

The Writings of al-'Aṭṭār

The attitude of the new regime toward Sūfism was ambivalent. As a coherent vision of reality, it attracted and brought together many of the intellectuals of the Ottoman Empire. Also, the *ṭarīqa* was a refuge within which one could find one's balance. But no one had managed to define a role for Sūfism in the new era.

This section deals with the relationship of al-'Aṭṭār to the mystical confraternities. Al-'Aṭṭār had lasting contacts with the Sūfī *ṭuruq* of his time, during his youth and thereafter, although he himself did not become a *murīd*. He had belonged to the Khalwatiya, as did a number of his Egyptian teachers and associates, and at the same time he had been initiated into the circles of the Sādāt al-Wafā'iya. The Khalwatīs sought from their disciples a rigorous *tahdhīb*, including *khalwa*. The Wafā'iya of the late eighteenth century did not require the path, but it was the convention among them to reflect on the spiritual qualities of their Shaykh, Muḥammad Abī Anwār, in their writings. Al-'Aṭṭār did not comply with the practices of either of the two orders. His period of study of Sūfī texts in Damascus was probably more a literary diversion than a period of religiosity. It was his intellectual

commitment to science and theology which obliged him to be concerned with mystical religion, for the later development of science and logic in Islamic history was carried on by Sūfis.

Among the most important facts which emerge from al-'Aṭṭār's relations with the two Egyptian orders is the fact that he could not make the fundamental commitment to be a *murīd*. The alternative of "abandoning" mysticism was not, of course, posed. In this ambience, al-'Aṭṭār appeared to share the position of many Sūfis, especially Naqshbandīs and Khalwatis, who identified with the dominant class and adhered to a Sharī'a-minded theology.

The great appeal of Sūfism remained for him cultural, the surrender of the literal to the allegorical, and this was the case in his adult life as it had been in his youth. Al-'Aṭṭār's attitudes toward mystical thought developed gradually from an ambivalent acceptance to an ambivalent rejection, broadly corresponding to his shift from Ash'arism to Māturīdism. His mature position in about 1830 was basically that mystical thought was best left to those who understood it.

In 1830, al-'Aṭṭār's position on the nature of mysticism crystallized, and he attempted to confront the problem of his own relationship to it. Concerning the "principles (*mabādi*) of Sūfism," he wrote that Sūfism was a "science" with its own principles and objectives, but he acknowledged that it was not like other sciences since it was a resultant of all other fields. Sūfism was of two basic sorts: the first was ethics, the second relied on masters, on flashes of revelation. Al-'Aṭṭār preferred the first, the idea that Sūfism was not wearing of wool, weeping, singing, dancing, or wandering as a madman but rather purification without turbidity. "For he who is pure is called Sūfi."³⁴

These words, drawn from his major work, which was written between 1828 and 1830, show the degree to which a strict Sharī'a consciousness dominates mystical consciousness. The most that al-'Aṭṭār would accept was the possibility that God had granted to some what He had withheld from others. Al-'Aṭṭār did not accept the mystical way as having any exemplary value. For him, the genuineness of religious experiences was directly related to the degree to which it adhered to the Sharī'a. The formulation of his analysis of Sūfism, that is, the concept of the two types of Sūfism, the one the antithesis of the other, is derived from *kalām*, not from *taṣawwuf* (mysticism). Al-'Aṭṭār's interest in mysticism as religion was the scholarly interest of a *mutakallim* in the subject. In Damascus, when he was studying with Shaykh al-Yāfi, he admitted to owning a copy of *Al-Futūḥāt al-makkiyya*, but when he attempted to explicate the difference between "*rahman*" and "*rahīm*" as describing God's attribute of mercifulness, he did so not from this source but as a problem in philology, which represents a profound shift in the semantic direction.³⁵

The "reformulation of mysticism" by al-'Aṭṭār so that it was subsumed under the Sharī'a and the appeal of mysticism as a cultural form are characteristic of his period and his social situation. For the intellectuals of the

1830's, knowledge was becoming fragmented and compartmentalized. This was true of Western knowledge and it was reflected in the revival of *kalām*. Holistic speculative thought was not easy in this situation for them. The opposite, however, was true for the downtrodden Ahl al-Ḥadīth, for whom the inward-turning, integrative vision was entirely possible. Most of the important Ṣūfīs of the nineteenth century came from such a background.

*The Study of Traditional Logic and the Development
of Modern Secular Culture*

Heretofore, I have referred to logic a number of times, generally in a slightly pejorative manner. It was described as having been imposed by structural necessities brought about by the industrial revolution, as coexisting uncomfortably with Māturīdite theology, and as having been used as a weapon for ideological purposes. Finally, it was shown performing a rather sophistic refutation of mysticism. There was more to the revival of the logical sciences than this, a point which has often been missed. The revival of the study of classical logic in the nineteenth century was a scholastic endeavor which obviously depended from a technical point of view on what material was accessible. One could argue, however, that the turn to the formal study of logic was part of a general intellectual response to modern conditions, an effort to rise above the process of piecemeal, ad hoc adaptation to situations as they arose, to a more general stance. Al-ʿAṭṭār's writing was central to the tradition of rationalism in Egypt in the nineteenth century.

The history of logic in the Islamic world had been associated largely with the rise and decline of the "Baghdad School" of the tenth century. Thereafter, the study of logic, from a modern European point of view, made very little advance; in the eleventh century, the only important figure was Ibn Sīnā, and after that there was only the brief connection between logic and astronomy in the thirteenth century in the circle of Naṣīr al-dīn al-Ṭūsī. Thereafter, the influence of theology on logical studies was paramount in the writings of such figures as the theologian al-Bayḍāwī and the later *mutakallimīn*, such as ʿAbdullah ibn ʿUmar and al-Dawwānī. The study of logic also became increasingly connected with the study of Arabic grammar, beginning with al-Qazwīnī al-Kātibī, known as the Imām al-Ḥaramayn. The use of logic as an independent tool, à la the Muʿtazilites, was ritualistically denounced in all the elementary books on *kalām*.³⁶

In eighteenth-century Egypt, the study of logic was, while not neglected, developed in a fashion suitable to the needs of the *ḥadīth* movement. The principal text by Muḥammad al-Ṣabbān was a very short book which devoted exactly two pages to reasoning by analogy. It actually dealt with topics in *ḥadīth* at greater length.³⁷ In the beginning of his book, al-Sabbān devoted a section to the religious reasons for invoking the names of different caliphs and so on.

The principal revival of logic in Egypt occurred during the reform period and continued throughout the nineteenth century. It centered around three

figures, all of whom served as Shaykh al-Azhar: Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār, Ḥasan al-Quwaynsī, and Ibrāhīm al-Bājūrī. This discussion will be limited to a treatment of the writings of al-ʿAṭṭār. Al-ʿAṭṭār wrote three works and a number of lesser compositions on logic.³⁹ The term "revival" of course needs to be used advisedly, as the content of al-ʿAṭṭār's writings in particular has been singularly criticized for its lack of originality. Its importance lies, historically, in the larger alignment of the study of logic with the reformism of Muḥammad ʿAlī. Compared to that of the classical age, writing of logic was weak; there were numerous misunderstandings of technical terms and the emphasis on argument by analogy led to frequent errors.³⁹ *The Fifth Book of Aristotle*, which dealt with *al-burhān* (proof) and *al-jadal* (argumentation), was poorly presented in al-ʿAṭṭār's period. From the perspective of the study of logic in the classical period, an account of its development in later centuries is perhaps irrelevant. From the point of view of modern history, however, a selective revival of parts of the Aristotelian tradition at the expense of others calls for an investigation.

Al-ʿAṭṭār on Logic

In his first main work, al-ʿAṭṭār attempted to show that logic was an important subject which must be studied. He chose to write a gloss on a text by the Indian Muḥibb Allāh al-Bihārī (died 1707/1119) which was particularly concerned with analogy, called "Sullam al-ʿulūm fī'l-mantiq."⁴⁰ Al-ʿAṭṭār undertook this work after his return from his travels, after he was given the commentary by his friend and student then Qāḍī Arif Hikmet. Through his student, al-ʿAṭṭār became acquainted with the text and with the commentaries which others had written on it, because, as he said, it was unknown in Egypt until his own time. Al-ʿAṭṭār knew some of the rudimentary biographical facts about al-Bihārī. The Qāḍī had come in contact with some of the students of his commentator while he was in Madina. Al-ʿAṭṭār also states that he knew some of the contemporary literature on the text and mentions the work of a contemporary, Baḥr al-ʿUlūm ʿAbd al-ʿAlī b. Muḥammad Nizām al-dīn al-Lakhnawī (died 1810/1225). Al-ʿAṭṭār referred to others but did not mention them by name, nor did he mention his opinion of these various writers. Baḥr al-ʿUlūm, for example, was known to have been a mystic of the school of Muḥī al-dīn ibn al-ʿArabī.⁴¹ Furthermore, al-ʿAṭṭār did not mention the best known commentary of al-Bihārī, a work which Brockelmann called the standard text of logic in India in the eighteenth century, the *Munḥiya* of Qāḍī Mubārak.⁴²

Al-Bihārī, author of the basic text, dealt extensively in his writings with the use of analogy and even dealt with the use of analogy by the Shīʿīs. However, he favored a Hanafī position: what is general (*ʿamm*) comes from the Qurʾān and *ḥadīth*. The dominant law school, the Shāfiʿīs permitted *al-raʾy*. The Shāfiʿīs limit the absolute (i.e., the general) by analogy, while the Hanafīs do not. Concerning the use of *ḥadīth*, al-Bihārī followed the Hanafī practice: he would not accept the bearer of *ḥadīth* except after

al-ra'y, while the Shāfi'is use *al-ra'y* only if the bearer does not have an *isnād* (chains of authorities), or is not supported by another *rāwī*, or if it is known that he is unreliable.⁴³

Al-'Aṭṭār obviously composed this work for an audience which had some doubt about the status of logic as a discipline, and perhaps associated it with Mu'tazilism. On folio 15A, al-'Aṭṭār includes in his definition of logic such points as that it was not a "divine" science, but neither was it philosophy, a forbidden science. In citing his sources, he mentioned "the gloss of our teacher al-Ṣabbān" and more often the gloss of Shaykh al-Mallāwī. Reference to familiar sources from the *ḥadīth* revival would have had the effect of making his work more acceptable, and this was needed.

A few years later, al-'Aṭṭār wrote a gloss on the famous *Al-Īsāghūjī* of Athīr al-dīn al-Abharī (died A.D. 1264). It seems probable that al-'Aṭṭār's interest in this manual was aroused by the fact that so many of the later *mutakallimīn* commented on it. Also, members of al-Abharī's circle, especially Nāṣir al-dīn al-Ṭūsī, were very important to al-'Aṭṭār's scientific studies.⁴⁴ Contemporary observers affirm that the *Īsāghūjī* had a recognized place in the corpus of logic which was studied in the Ottoman Empire, along with other works on the subject of the syllogism, for example, Aristotle's "Alvīas."⁴⁵

Al-'Aṭṭār studied the text of the *Īsāghūjī* through later commentaries, mainly that of Zakariyā al-Anṣārī (1422–1520). Al-Anṣārī was very much a representative of the later medieval trend which fused logic with theology and separated it from science and philosophy.⁴⁶ As this was not al-'Aṭṭār's orientation, it is not surprising to find him rebelling against the views of al-Anṣārī and praising instead the writings of earlier *mutakallimīn* and logicians, such as Mīr Zāhid. In one place, al-'Aṭṭār argued that al-Anṣārī did not understand what is meant by the term *'ilm* (science), citing the views of Mīr Zāhid; elsewhere, he rejected the views of his commentator and followed Mīr Zāhid in his discussion of the whole and the part.⁴⁷ Criticisms of the well-known work of Zakariyā al-Anṣārī were a part of al-'Aṭṭār's critique of the study of logic by *ḥadīth* students in the eighteenth century. This was doubtless an easy target, although perhaps sensitive. In the introduction to *Hāshiya 'alā . . . al-Īsāghūjī*, al-'Aṭṭār stated that he was relying on a gloss on the *Īsāghūjī* by Yūsuf al-Ḥifnāwī. The latter was the brother of the Ṣūfī *shaykh* and not an important scholar in his own right. His short text was a wholly insignificant work.⁴⁸ Al-'Aṭṭār treated it very seriously, however, stating that it was not entirely comprehensible to students and that he had to disagree with some of the author's views. Thereafter, al-'Aṭṭār switched to a discussion of works which he said were of value in the field of logic. He mentioned such books as the commentary of al-Quṭb al-Rāzī on the text "Al-Maṭālī" (al-Bayḍāwī), al-Rāzī's glosses on the text "Al-Shamsiyya" (al-Kātibī), the gloss of al-Taftazānī on the text of "Al-Shamsiyya," along with its subcommentaries by Jalāl al-dīn al-Dawwānī and Amīr Abī'l-Fath (called "Hawāshi al-fathiyya"). These were, of course, some of the major texts in *kalām*.⁴⁹ In praising the virtues of these Ahl al-Kalām al-

'Aṭṭār was preparing to rehabilitate al-Abhari's student al-Ṭūsī, who had to be "salvaged" from the reputation, not only as a Shi'ī, but also as a *muta-kallim*.

The last main work on logic which al-'Aṭṭār undertook was completed in 1825/1240; it was his gloss on the commentary of 'Ubaydullah al-Khabīṣī on the *Tahdhib*. As in previous works, he referred warmly to the tradition of *kalām*, which he called the way of the *muḥaqqiqīn*, a term reserved for those who took an approach based on reason but within the bounds of the Sharī'a. These included the works of 'Abd al-Hakīm al-Siyalkūtī, "Al-Maṭūl," and Mīr Zāhid, "Risālat al-Rāzī fī'l-taṣawwur wa'l-taṣdiq."⁵⁰

Among the few Arab writers whom al-'Aṭṭār dignified with the rank of *muḥaqqiq* was Yāsīn b. Zayn al-dīn. In nearly every case, however, he referred to Indian writers on *kalām* in preference to later figures from the Arab world. In this work, he attacked Ibn Sa'īd al-Maghribī, who had criticized Shaykh Yāsīn.

The gloss on al-Khabīṣī created a reputation for al-'Aṭṭār both in Egypt and abroad. His Moroccan friend Sīdī al-'Arabī al-Dumnātī, the court figure, praised it effusively.⁵¹ Perhaps more importantly, this *ḥāshiya* (gloss) became incorporated into the curriculum of Egyptian higher education, as did *Al-Azharīya* in grammar. In his reform of the curriculum of the college of Dār al-'Ulūm in 1901–1903, Muḥammad 'Abdu retained the work of al-'Aṭṭār in logic. In 1911, it was supplemented by the *Risāla* of Sultan Muḥammad for fourth-year students.⁵²

Ādāb al-Baḥṭh (Argumentation)

Background

The progress of the study of *ādāb al-baḥṭh* closely resembled that of logic; for, indeed, it was virtually a branch of logic. It was well known in Turkey in the eighteenth century, but its principal recovery in Egypt came in the early nineteenth century. As was the case with logic, there were a few texts written in al-Azhar in the eighteenth century, for example, by Muḥammad al-Ṣabbān and Aḥmad al-Sijā'ī, but the character of the discipline changed with the growing interest in argument by analogy (*qiyās*). The field likewise owed much to the contributions of the '*ulamā*' of India and to the revival and spread of the Naqshbandīs from India, which was very important in terms of its accessibility. Al-'Aṭṭār gained a head start in this field, which was little known in Egypt, through his study of it in Damascus.⁵³ His works became standard texts.

Al-'Aṭṭār's Writings on Ādāb al-Baḥṭh

Al-'Aṭṭār's interests within *ādāb al-baḥṭh* changed radically, from employing it in religious disputes in Syria to making it serve more secular needs for

argument to "reconcile, adjust, and modify." This lends credence to my hypothesis regarding the concern with analogy and the kind of problems which Muḥammad 'Alī faced. In his first work, written in Egypt in 1795, it is clear that al-'Aṭṭār was grappling with the contours of the discipline rather than being concerned with its application. There is no emphasis on *qiyās*, although even at this time he was aware of many Indian sources. His reliance on Indian sources anticipates what he later said about the isolated state of the field in Egypt. For example, al-'Aṭṭār stated in the introduction to his second work: "Muḥammad al-Mar'ashī, known as Sajaqli-Zadeh, was the most famous of the later distillers of *adāb al-baḥṭh* in his 'Taqrīr al-Qawānīn' and then his 'Risāla walādiya' . . . when al-Zabīdī was in Egypt, no one taught these two books, nor were they known until some trouble-makers [*al-afātin*] came to Egypt from among the established professors."⁵⁴ Al-'Aṭṭār proceeded, after this oblique criticism, to praise the scholars in Turkey who were much more interested in this field. On his return to Egypt, he reported teaching this work to some notables who had not studied it previously. Damascus had been the place where this work was actually completed.

Damascus in the early nineteenth century was an arena in which were debated the merits of the Ṭarīqa Muḥammadiya, the doctrine of the unity of man with God (*Waḥdat al-wujūd*), and Māturidism versus Ash'arism, as well as Wahhābism.⁵⁵ It was clearly being in Damascus which created a certain urgency for the study of the discipline for al-'Aṭṭār. This is manifested in his striving for precision of meaning, through rules which could be understood, rules concerning the generalization of meaning or concerning whether a word was used as a metaphor, as an honorific, or, if not as a metaphor, then in a combination form between the literal and the metaphorical.⁵⁶

In al-'Aṭṭār's last work on *adāb al-baḥṭh*, which was undertaken after he had returned to Egypt, one can see a still further degree of progress in the direction of secular culture and at the same time some basic continuity of the discipline. What was new was the rationale which al-'Aṭṭār gave for the study of this discipline. He said that it was an "independent discipline," that its rules helped to distinguish the general from the particular, and that it provided rules of argumentation. Al-'Aṭṭār went on to compare it to logic in that it served many other fields, since no field is free from the conflicts of views which require reconciliation, adjustment, and modification, all of which depend on the syllogism.⁵⁷

What stands out in this work is the concept of the "independent field," a concept which one finds only in al-'Aṭṭār's last writings. This represents a subtle shift away from the framework implicit in his earlier work, for example, in his revival of Islamic science within the context of *al-hikma*. It marks a step toward the acceptance of the intellectual fragmentation of knowledge of the bourgeois era. The loss of the medieval unity is still somewhat implicit in al-'Aṭṭār's thought; even where he admires the methodology of Western science and praises scientific specialization (see Chapter

5), he does not understand the full implications of the effect of changing conditions on his outlook.

In the transition from corporate structure to class structure, the role of religion itself changed. Gradually, religion ceased to uphold the medieval unity of religion and state, "*dīn wa dawla*," and the unity of all knowledge. Theoretically, it did as before, but fragmentation was increasingly the reality. One may still speak of the religious framework of culture, but without either speaking of religiosity (at least as the eighteenth century knew it) or asking what is meant by framework other than law. Discussing the phase termed "merchant capitalism" in the eighteenth century I spoke of secular culture as a byproduct of religious scholarship; during the reform period, Māturidite *kalām* was itself molded by logic, which served the juridical needs of the state. Here was a revival of Aristotle, but without the Aristotelian logos or theoretical reason. This left only the rationalism of instrumentality or of practice. The real "logos" was Europe. Between the two was the Māturidite numen, which held that faith, not pure reason, sanctioned the rationalism of instrumentality. Māturidite theology became a middle road which connected the ruling class to its own society, on the one hand, and to Europe, on the other, condemning the extremes of both. Māturidite reformism had arisen in India with the earlier impact of the Portuguese. It reached Egypt and gained in influence from the later eighteenth century as conditions similar to those in India prevailed.

Chapter 8

The Reform Period, 1815–1837, and the Development of Neoclassical Culture: The Study of Language Sciences, Literature, and History

This chapter presents a survey of the main writings of the reform period. These works reflected the dominant rational-deductive orientation discussed in the preceding chapter; furthermore, they were neoclassical in form. During this period, there were also a growing number of works of European inspiration. These were integrated into the dominant framework of thought and were used to fulfill certain concrete needs of the time. This period witnessed a noticeable expansion in the number and variety of works which could be termed secular, although the total production of writings fell precipitously from that of the eighteenth century. However, the progress of secular culture should not be taken as proof of modernity, as it often is in cultural history. More important to the culture of capitalism is utilitarianism, and this, as I have shown, may emerge in religion.

The onslaught against religion in the name of reason or secularism is, we are wrongly led to believe, a main theme of modern Western history. If one looks at all of Europe and chooses representative examples of the culture of different ruling classes, this is certainly not the case.¹ Even in areas in which secularism seems to have progressed the furthest, religion has a defined role. In no instances in the history of capitalism has atheism emerged among the ruling class as the end product of secularism; in fact, in the more highly developed capitalist societies, the contradictions of excessive individualism are projected intensely into religion in which God, no longer the simple watchmaker of early capitalist thought, must perform a more active role in the harmonization of interests.

In England after the first world war a religious revival took place among the ruling class, a literary expression of which can be found in the writings of T. S. Eliot. The return of "religious" conviction was neither an accident nor a transitory phenomenon. With the rise of organized labor in the 1890's and the great disillusionment with the European state system which followed World War I, the ruling class embraced the Church, an ally which it now needed.²

On the Continent, too, the course of development of the dialectic between secular and religious culture was grounded in the development of the economy and social structure. In France and Italy, for example, where the ruling class included large commercial as well as industrial sectors, these classes lacked the power for a prolonged period to transform the society as a whole as the English industrial bourgeoisie had done. Thus there arose in

these two countries and in other regions (e.g., southern and central Europe) polarities between regions or urban and rural areas. In politics, these polarities expressed themselves with some interruptions from the nineteenth century onward in the form of clerical versus anticlerical disputes. While class conflict entered into these struggles, a main characteristic was the struggle within the ruling class.

On the periphery of the world market, we find the early history of modern secular culture linked as in Europe to the specific course of capitalist development. In Egypt, as in Italy, the history of capitalism was largely bound up with commerce until the later nineteenth century, but with the difference that Egyptian commerce was controlled from abroad. Thus, unlike Italy, where indigenous centers of capital carried forward the process of economic transformation and differentiation, commerce on the periphery was much weaker as an economic force.

Cultural developments during the period between 1815 and 1837 reflect the measure of power and autonomy which Egypt possessed prior to its full integration into the world market. A rational-deductive outlook characterized all fields of inquiry. By the age of Isma'il, this gave way to more passive, absorptive cultural style *ḥadīth* studies. In the language sciences in the reform period, this was exemplified in the prominence of lexicography, which was developed for the purposes of the translation movement. The rulers needed to find or develop the logical Arabic equivalents of European words and concepts.

Language Sciences

Of the three subjects which are treated in this chapter, the most important for the medieval world was the language sciences. This was because revelation was vested in the Arabic language, which therefore had a special position. The preservation of the Arabic language was a religious obligation. In the Middle Ages, theorization about the nature of the language was permitted but within certain theological limits, as the main spirit was one of transmission. This meant that, particularly with respect to grammar, certain areas of substantive change were virtually closed. In other areas, however, important changes did take place, as in the field of lexicography. While this field produced no figures comparable in stature to al-Zabīdī in the eighteenth century, a group of scholars who entered the field as a by-product of their primary occupation as translators or book editors followed a new direction. This group needed to transfer with speed and accuracy concepts from modern European languages into Arabic and Turkish. Such works had been compiled in the medieval period, especially in pharmacology, with equivalents of terms made available in as many as five or six languages. What was new in this period was not the concern for equivalent terms, but the transfer of a body of concepts into a language which had not

been modernized.³ Lexicography thus came to be an arena for the practice of analogical reason (*qiyās*).

Al-Zabīdī's revival of lexicography, as an outgrowth of his *ḥadīth* study, was carried on and expanded by others who wished to find in the Arabic classical heritage the word or phrase which would convey a modern meaning. The writing of the "universal dictionary" broke down because of the complexity of technical subjects, and a number of more specialized dictionaries were composed. Collective projects were undertaken jointly by Europeans and Egyptians, for example, Don Raphael's Italian and Arabic dictionary. Apart from specialized dictionaries, there was a renewed interest in the structure and organization of existing dictionaries, reflecting the needs of the new users. Fāris Shidyaq attacked the "*qaṭṭā*, or rhyme, order" and called for a strict alphabetical order following the *Mujmal* of Ibn Fāris (died 387). He also argued against the inclusion of proper names and favored a more empirical approach to language. For example, he thought that the lexicographer should go and talk to the tribes and rely on the later Arabic writers as well as the earlier ones. His dictionary, the *ġāsūs*, marked a sharp break with the eighteenth-century lexicographical revival of al-Zabīdī on several main points, although it still lay clearly within the neoclassical tradition. The rejection of *qaṭṭā* order in favor of alphabetical order was not substantively significant and was again rejected as it had been earlier. But what is important is that Shidyaq's work reflected the view that the utility of the language was relative and changeable. While previously there had been an intimate connection with rhyme order and poetry, by the nineteenth century the needs which society imposed on the language scholar were different. Shidyaq's concern with a historical approach to language is important. It showed that his conception of language was linked less to the single event of the revelation of the Qur'ān than to its larger historical development. For Shidyaq, the meaning of going to the tribes was different than it had been for al-Zabīdī. For the latter, it was a matter of faith that the reports of the tribes would confirm and clarify the medieval sources. Shidyaq did not believe this a priori. For both, it was an article of faith that the history of the tribes was one and the same, that their language remained pure through lack of contact with "corrupting" influences.

Shidyaq was not the first writer to undertake a criticism of medieval lexicography, but he was the first to do so from a modern, secular perspective. The distinction has led to confusions. Germanus Farḥāt wrote a dictionary at the beginning of the eighteenth century. He followed the *qaṭṭā* order but dropped many of the obscure usages for flowers, rivers, and mountains and omitted the discursive essays found in al-Firūzabādī's *Qāmūs*. This is perhaps the basis for his work's claim to fame. Following the comments of a later editor of this work, one can deduce that the principal consequences of these adaptations was to render Arabic lexicography more suitable for propagating the Catholic faith. The dictionary included numerous biblical references. As a consequence of the secular needs posed by the

translation movement, the traditional Arabic lexicography continued to develop. Lane undertook to work within it with the help of Azhar *shaykhs*. The British in India apparently also saw its utility. A notice in *Journal des Savans* mentioned that a copy of the *Qāmūs* "collated with many manuscript copies of this work was corrected for the press by Shaykh Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Anṣārī 'Yumuni-Yoosh' Shīrwānī, employed in the College of Fort Williams, Calcutta, 1817 A.D."⁴

In spirit, lexicography reflected the changes which the era had brought for the cultural elite. This elite was now involved in positivist science and was becoming impatient with the state of the language, desiring to organize it to fit modern needs. These feelings were manifested long before the mechanisms to effect the necessary adaptation, such as *al-ishtiḳāq* (the deriving of words), were revived. The study of grammar, which had in the eighteenth century been related to the *ḥadīth* movement, became in the nineteenth century, especially in the writings of its leading figure, Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār, more closely aligned with logic. The content of Arabic grammar was not challenged by the intellectual reforms of Muḥammad ʿAlī, but the growing utilitarian spirit of the age affected the style of presentation and pedagogy. The movement to reorganize the teaching of grammar and the approach to understanding grammar as a rational science converged in the works of Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār. His writings, especially those in grammar, have had a lasting influence in Egypt, virtually to the present generation.

In turning to the writings of al-ʿAṭṭār on grammar between 1815 and 1830 and to the writings of his students, the importance of the neoclassical revival to the creation of a modern secular culture becomes increasingly apparent. Al-ʿAṭṭār began in this period to abandon the methods of teaching and writing which had characterized eighteenth-century Egypt and which he himself had employed earlier in his life. With the reaction to the *ḥadīth* movement, there came a reaction to the approach to all knowledge through the "chain of authority." The *ḥadīth* movement had probably encouraged the writing of glosses (*ḥawāshī*), a genre which had begun to appear in Egypt in the eighteenth century in large numbers, but it perhaps discouraged the production of "independent" works. Paradoxically, this is the period in which one finds the greatest creativity. The later reaction against the *ḥadīth* revival encouraged the tendency to edit classical selections, to compose works not linked in any way to *ijāzāt*, that is, linked to one's teachers, but it did not have time to mature. The reform movement in language sciences among a small group of scholars in the service of Muḥammad ʿAlī naturally did not destroy the former traditions of pedagogy. These were clung to tenaciously by the majority of *ʿulamāʾ* until the early twentieth century. In fact, with the British occupation, one finds the evolution of an even more exaggerated concealment, the *taqrīr*, which is commentary on a gloss.

Al-ʿAṭṭār's participation in editing an anthology was obviously connected with his association with the institution of the Būlāq Press, for the book appeared in 1825/1240 as one of its earliest printed works. This book was

entitled *Hadhihi majmū'a fi 'ilm al-taṣrīf* and contained selections from a number of classical grammatical writers. The principal grammarian was Aḥmad b. 'Alī b. Mas'ūd, who was known for his *Marāḥ al-arwāḥ*.⁵

In al-'Aṭṭār's other works on grammar, he chose to write on several commentaries at the same time. The spirit in which the gloss was conceived would normally, of course, preclude this. In one gloss dated 1827/1235, five commentaries are mentioned as the basis. In this work,⁶ he still continued to employ examples from Arabic poetry, although to a lesser extent than he had in the eighteenth century. Perhaps this was because the independent study of literature had in the post-Napoleonic era become slightly more acceptable again.⁷

Al-'Aṭṭār was in this regard rather ahead of his era. Even he was not free to avoid the "traditions"; nor could his students pursue the language sciences without reference to the past.⁸ Nonetheless, al-'Aṭṭār's efforts to recover the classical texts, such as those of Mas'ūd, which approached grammar through *ra'y*, and his assault on the pedagogy of grammar seen in the perspective of two hundred years still seem quite radical, especially as the morphology of even the contemporary language does not differ notably from that of the classical.⁹

Finally, an influence on the development of philological studies in Egypt which remains unassessed is the role of Orientalists. A body of literature exists which shows the close relationship which existed in the 1830's and 1840's between the correctors and editors, on the one hand, and the Western Orientalists, on the other. The orientation toward rationalism in cultural studies in Egypt may have led some *shaykhs* to become interested in the primitive structuralist theories of language which were being developed in Europe during this period. A simpler explanation, of course, is that numerous Orientalists appeared and needed help with Arabic.¹⁰

Literature

Literary prose declined with the gradual decline of the *maqāma* form after al-'Aṭṭār. The principal achievement in this area was in the revival of letter writing, which served an important function as Arabic became the language of government. In poetry, the *waṭanīyāt*, or patriotic themes, marked a development over the earlier expressions found in eighteenth-century lyric poetry. More challenging to the literary utilitarianism of the age was the continuing revival of Andalusian literature, and the imitation of its forms. Perhaps the greatest long-term impact of the Andalusian cultural heritage was in the area of music, where the *muwashshahāt* have played a role until the present.

Composition and letter writing had been highly developed in Egypt in Mamlūk times and did not require a great deal of adaptation given the structure of society. Al-'Aṭṭār had had a number of years of experience with *inshā'* dating back to about 1815. In writing the major *inshā'*, however, al-

'Aṭṭār produced an important work which greatly exceeded in scope what might actually have been required.¹¹ Al-'Aṭṭār wrote his work for the secretaries of the new Jihādīya school and praised Muḥammad 'Alī in his introduction. The connection between the creation of the new institutions and the use of this literary form is thus quite clear. The development of the *Inshā'* as a manual for writers in government service was different than and more elaborate than the *inshā'* of al-Zabīdī and al-Jabartī in the eighteenth century.¹²

Al-'Aṭṭār's *Inshā'* is divided into two parts. The first and longer of the two is devoted to the writing of different types of letters. The second is devoted to the writing of various legal documents (*al-shurūṭ wa'l-sukūk*). Among the justifications for writing this work, which he gives in the introduction, is his concern "for how the ruler and his lieutenant would be communicating." The first section is composed in *saj'*, according to the norms of the period; the second part (pp. 100–119) is an instruction manual which is written in ordinary classical prose. Al-'Aṭṭār introduced this section with the cryptic comment that "traditionally, the '*ulamā'*' had considered this to be a separate field and it is a very beneficial one."

Al-'Aṭṭār was profoundly concerned with the problem of communication, but because of the nature of his audience, he stressed technical, not aesthetic, problems in many of his works. He stated that his own age was characterized by a deterioration in writing and copying and urged the secretaries to be concerned with accuracy. In another work in the same period, he complained of the *shaykh's* inattention even in their own writings. He stated, again in the *Inshā'*, that it was the responsibility of the copyist to give the author's full name, point of origin, tribe, honorific names, and so forth, for on this basis alone could one writer be distinguished from another. He stated that this type of precision was also required in any legal document. Such documents call for a rigorous description.¹³

The renewed dominance of insincere expression in the form of *saj'* was a major literary problem for writers of the reform period. In this respect the writers of the *majālis* of the eighteenth century were freer, and this in turn is reflected in the relative decline of *saj'* during the later eighteenth century.¹⁴ The important point lies with the nature of patronage. The *Inshā'* of al-'Aṭṭār shows clearly where the patronage was in the period of Muḥammad 'Alī.

The first section contains examples of how to write letters to kings, rulers, and members of the Ottoman court. The next section contains two examples of letters to the Sharif of Mecca, then to the Sultan of the Maghrib. The following sections contain letters to high-ranking military officials down to the provincial *amīr*. The section following that contains letters to *qādis*, '*ulamā'*', and *shaykhs*. Finally, letters for different occasions are included. In a society such as Egypt under Muḥammad 'Alī, which was based on hierarchy, where honor followed from rank, and where patronage and favoritism played an important role, exaggerated expressions of praise and mourning had a legitimate place. When the structure of society was altered

somewhat by the enlargement of the middle classes, as was the case in the age of Isma'īl, the characteristic literary needs also changed. Letters of this sort to the monarch and the poetry of the court and its circle continued to be required, but the characteristic mode of communication shifted from vertical to horizontal, and exaggeration of style was no longer necessary. In the major work on *inshā'* of the Isma'īl period, the use of *saj'* was extremely limited.¹⁵

Changes in the literary needs of the elite, beginning even in the Muḥammad 'Alī era, played a role in the breakdown of the dominance of *saj'*, notably in the translation movement. The movement began with nonspecialists, frequently Levantine translators, who knew European languages. The works of the first translation period were characterized by rhetoric and imprecision. With the return of the Egyptian mission students, *saj'* was abandoned except for the title page, and accuracy became more important.¹⁶ The Andalusian heritage was another influence against *saj'*. Al-Ṭaḥṭāwī greatly valued this aspect of his education with al-'Aṭṭār and repeated years later fragments of al-'Aṭṭār's favorite poetry, praising him for his life-long devotion to the study of Andalusian literature.¹⁷

The impact on literature of the cultural links which existed between the Egyptians and the Ottomans remains unstudied. The older view that the Ottomans brought the use of *saj'* to Egypt has been discarded without a new hypothesis to replace it. If we relate language style to social relations, it is not difficult to imagine Levantines and Ottomans in this period using exaggerated forms, while the Egyptian middle class would struggle against it—at least those who had the option of putting up such a struggle. Not surprisingly, Muḥammad 'Alī's secretary of the 1820's, Khayret Efendi, used *saj'* continuously; another Turk whose education had been partly Egyptian, Arif Hikmet used *saj'* somewhat less. Several Egyptian poets used *saj'* when they wrote for Muḥammad 'Alī. Finally, with the arrival of Sami Bey and the rationalization of the institutional structures of the early 1830's, the use of Ottoman itself was said to gain in precision.¹⁸

The principal literary phenomenon was the decline of the *maqāma* in the first half of the nineteenth century. Some of the reasons have already been given; they broadly correspond to the reasons for the revival of *inshā'* and to *saj'*. Others have been suggested in the fifth and sixth chapters. The struggle to dominate prose pitted a bourgeois realism—in journalism, translation, and literature—against the aristocratic, hierarchic use of language called *saj'*. Each according to the dynamics of the larger society was utilitarian and in a sense rationalist. However, the *maqāma* was subject to struggles not only within the cultural elite, but also between the cultural elite as a whole and the intelligentsia of the suppressed middle classes. *Maqāmāt* continued to be used in the religious education and scholarship of this class as it had more generally been in the eighteenth century. Al-Hariri was used throughout the century in connection with *ḥadīth* studies. The dependence on the *maqāma* form by this class for didactic purposes boded ill for its evolution into a form intended for upper-class entertain-

ment and edification. At the same time, there was a genuine attempt on the part of Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār, whose *Maqāma* was studied in Chapter 4, and his student al-Ṭaḥṭāwī and others to promote the *maqāma* within the framework of bourgeois realism.¹⁹ The ultimate decline of the *maqāma* in this latter sense was a reflection of the growing dependence of the upper classes on Europe by the middle of the century and the increasingly clear identification of the *maqāma* with traditional merchant culture.

The poetry of the reform period presents some of the most extreme examples of exaggerated praise and barren imagery. It was the last age in which the court was the only patron, and it was an age of decline in comparison to the later eighteenth century. The only new development was the *waṭaniya*, or patriotic poem. An examination of the *waṭaniya* as literature, apart from the theme itself, does not yield much that is new. Praise of the country, or more correctly of the dynasty, could be found in the eighteenth century. The imagery and technique of the early *waṭaniyāt* added little to what was available; there is no new development of feeling. It is said that the *waṭaniya* was a response by al-Ṭaḥṭāwī to Europe. Actually, it began with al-ʿAṭṭār and his pupil Shihāb ad-dīn.²⁰ Al-Ṭaḥṭāwī contributed very little until later in his life.

The poetry of the reform period employed the most mechanical application of *sajʿ* to a range of themes, European and medieval Arabic. Shihāb ad-dīn revealed in his *Diwān*, as did his contemporary ʿAlī Darwīsh in his, in startling depth the deadening life in a bureaucratic environment.²¹ Yet Shihāb ad-dīn was steeped in literary culture, classical and modern. The best reading of his poems in *sajʿ* on the English government and in praise of European consuls would be that on some level he intended exaggeration to convey mockery.

For al-ʿAṭṭār, in the later part of his life, literature was something he regarded with nostalgia. Neoclassicism was becoming dry and intellectualized. It had lost the feeling of his youthful *Maqāma*. While he still preferred the Arabic popular poetry *zaghāl* and *muwashshahāt* to other forms, his writings were theoretical arguments, virtually an outgrowth of his work in logic.²² Where earlier, Al-ʿAṭṭār spoke of moonlit nights and cups of wine, when he wrote in the 1820's about *Kitāb al-musāmarāt* and *Turjūmān al-ashwāq*, he approached these erotic and mystical works as a theoretician of aesthetics.²³ These became the springboard to an attack on the neo-Pythagorean ideas of the Ikhwān al-Ṣafāʾ (brethren of purity). They had claimed that the study of music demonstrates that the world conforms to arithmetical and geometrical relations. Al-ʿAṭṭār rejected this, claiming that the science of music is a separate discipline. The principal justification which al-ʿAṭṭār gave for this claim was that music had its own distinct sphere of practical application. Music, he said, almost quoting Ibn al-ʿArabī, was useful for swaying man's soul, which meant that it can be used to encourage him to do tiring physical labor and to encourage those who participate in war (although money is needed for these also). Al-ʿAṭṭār offered a warning that music has stirred up wars and passions.²⁴

While the Ikhwān themselves were not in the least acceptable to the 'ulamā' of al-Azhar, the general idea of music as integrated into a larger intellectual whole was a broad common denominator which could unite the conservative religious studies in 'ilm al-qawāfa (science of rhyme) with those of the mystics' use of music in the *dhikr*. What distinguished al-'Aṭṭār's position, and this was a revolutionary one, is the advocacy of the position that music should break free from any larger whole. Al-'Aṭṭār's rejection of the Ikhwānian theory of music in favor of the idea of music as an independent art form was still far from *l'art pour l'art*. It may have been evolving in that direction, but in the 1820's it was still almost a production of logic. Music was discussed as an analogy to various other practical arts which had their domain. Still his teaching of literature in the privacy of his home and his sustaining of the freer forms of poetry like the *muwashshaḥa* were in the long run of great importance to the development of literature in Egypt. Shihāb ad-dīn's famous compilation of *muwashshaḥāt*, which influenced the music from the age of Isma'īl on, had its origins in al-'Aṭṭār's work.

History and Geography

In the writings of al-'Aṭṭār and al-Ṭaḥṭāwī, history and geography drew their inspiration from Islamic rationalism to confront the positions which had been advanced by the writers of the previous generation. Al-'Aṭṭār, basing himself on Ibn Khaldūn, dealt with the 'Alid tradition and its interpretation of the caliphate as well as its views on the Battle of Badr. Al-Ṭaḥṭāwī, who studied with al-'Aṭṭār, based his own geographical and historical work on Abū'l-Fida'. He made his *riḥla* into a polemic for reform.

Al-'Aṭṭār wrote a major work in the field of history based on the methodology of Ibn Khaldūn. In so doing, he transformed a traditional religious topic of veneration into a basis for rationalist-cum-secular argument. It is clear, from the title, that it was partly Ottoman inspired.²⁵ The subject is one which had often been raised in previous works, the sequence of legitimate caliphs and the justification for the rule of the family of 'Uthmān as the legitimate successor to the earlier caliphate. What is unusual in this period is the degree to which Māturīdism relied on naturalistic causality, while of course opposing *falsafa*. This is shown in the concept of '*aṣabiya*' (group loyalty, or solidarity) which is invoked in this essay to explain the success of certain caliphs. The style of writing is a clear modern prose with no *saj'*, a fact as striking as the content itself.

The first topic in this book is the Khilāfa, the caliphate. It was al-'Aṭṭār's intention to explain the special role of the Quraysh, the Meccan tribe from which the Prophet arose, and at the same time to reject certain Shī'ī ideas on the *imāma*. The first source which al-'Aṭṭār quotes is Abū Bakr al-Baqillānī, but the second is Ibn Khaldūn. Ibn Khaldūn, al-'Aṭṭār stated, said that the Prophet mentioned the Quraysh, not because of some special bless-

ing, but to accomplish certain objectives, notably the general welfare (*al-maṣlaḥa*). Their designation, Ibn Khaldūn concluded, was related to their widely agreed upon virtues, among which was social solidarity (*al-aṣabiyya*), which granted them a certain freedom from internal feuds.

In his discussion of the Rāshidūn period, the Battle of Badr was one of several topics which al-ʿAṭṭār discussed. It was dealt with without *ḥadīth* sources and without commentary on the *shuhadaʾ*, or martyrs. The main problem which al-ʿAṭṭār dealt with in the Rāshidūn section was the reason for the breakdown of the original *aṣabiyya*, which led to the feuds and permitted the rise of the Umayyads. Al-ʿAṭṭār found the division of loyalties between ʿAlī and Muʿāwiya explicable in terms of geographical differences (Syria vs. other regions), tribal loyalties (the opposition of the tribes from Rabiʿ and Yaman to ʿAlī), and occupational loyalties (support for ʿAlī from the military), but that the decisive factor was the *aṣabiyya* of the Syrian troops who had been through the experience of the conquest. He gave precedence to this over the weakening of ʿAlī's forces by the desertion of the Khawārij.²⁶

With the rise of Muʿāwiya, al-ʿAṭṭār's mild ʿAlid sympathies, gathered perhaps from his Wafāʾiyya background, emerge: "The crowd accepted the designation of Muʿāwiya in the middle of the year 41, at which point the people had forgotten prophecy and had forgotten miracles and sided with solidarity and military triumph. Thus the Banū Umayya and Muʿāwiya were appointed by their victory over the Muḍar and the other Arabs on their great day."²⁷

Al-ʿAṭṭār's treatment of ʿAbbāsīd history (folios 15–24) is largely a discussion of the development of Shīʿism with some references to the Zaydis and the Rāfidis, not to be expected, given his overall theme of the Khilāfa. At the same time, it was his intention to refute the Shīʿī account of Muḥammad's deathbed designation of ʿAlī, which many of the Ahl al-Bayt accepted. In his argument, he turned to *ḥadīth*, citing ʿĀ'isha's rejection of this account. Al-ʿAṭṭār gives his view in the beginning of the discussion: "It should be known that the basis of this dynasty was that the Ahl al-Bayt, following the death of the Prophet, saw themselves as being the rightful heirs to rule and not the tribe of Quraysh."²⁸

Al-ʿAṭṭār denied the claims of ʿAlī but argued also against the claim that the subsequent dynasties, ʿAbbāsīd and Fāṭimid, lacked ʿAlid roots. The defect of the ʿAbbāsīd state was that its rulers, one after the other, permitted it to grow weaker until it was conquered by the Mongols. In contrast, the Ottomans maintained their strength.

In his discussion of the special virtues (*manāqib*) of the Ottomans, al-ʿAṭṭār stated that the role of reunifying the Sunnī world was reserved for them. This world had so disintegrated (note the opposite of *aṣabiyya*) into small units that the village *shaykhs* grew ignorant of their religion. Among the special virtues of the House of ʿUthmān was the conquest of Constantinople, which had been attempted repeatedly since Umayyad times. Al-ʿAṭṭār concluded the essay with a series of ambiguous comments, perhaps

reflecting the intentional ambiguity of one who is writing under certain constraints. "Among the special virtues of this state was also that it protected the pale of Islam. But after a while Islam became strangely weak, a piece of whiteness surrounded by the blackness of its enemies. It was as if God had absented himself, leaving it to face the most severe troubles."²⁹ Al-'Aṭṭār was not in a position, as was al-Ṭaḥṭāwī, to initiate the long discussion in Arabic writing on the strength of the West.

One might note the effect of al-'Aṭṭār's use of Ibn Khaldūn on the traditional eighteenth-century account of the Battle of Badr and the special virtues of its heroes. The Badriyyīn are transformed by Al-'Aṭṭār into an abstract collective force, characterized by a certain social solidarity, which ran all through Sunnī history. In the eighteenth-century accounts, the Badriyyīn had been studied one by one, that is, as individual moral examples. The emphasis on the use of logic and analysis is clear throughout, even though the author does not entirely eschew the use of *ḥadīth* sources. It would seem to be the first integrated work of Arab historical analysis in modern times. Unlike the great work of al-Jabartī, it is not compartmentalized but pursues a central theme and argument to the end.

One topic which it treated was a matter of special concern to al-'Aṭṭār: Shi'ism. His principal source for his studies on natural science was an Imāmīte, Nāṣir al-dīn al-Ṭūsī. In his work on *al-handasa*, which will be discussed in Chapter 9 and elsewhere, al-'Aṭṭār attempted to defend the views expressed in al-Ṭūsī's book *Matn al-tajrid*. Another concern was to moderate the exaggerated claims of the *ṣaḥāba* movement in Egypt. His essay apparently attempted to accomplish both tasks.³⁰

Al-'Aṭṭār's use of Ibn Khaldūn's general conceptual framework was not limited to the above work, but can be found in another work on tribal history. In this work on the tribes of Egypt, al-Maqrīzī had discussed the Awlād al-Muqaddam, who lived between Greater 'Aqaba and Alexandria,³¹ and their various subdivisions. He suggested that they might have originated from the Ghatafān in Arabia. Al-'Aṭṭār, commenting on this particular discussion, stated, "Now [in the 1820's] their genealogy has become mixed," meaning that they are no longer distinctly Bedouins but have become mixed with other elements of the society. Some, he said (referring to al-Maqrīzī's subdivisions) no longer existed; others had joined the ranks of the Egyptian *fallāḥīn*. This meant that only some of the Bedouin tribes have actually remained in a state of purity, and even those which have remained pure have become ignorant of their lineage and are no longer interested in it. Al-'Aṭṭār is grappling here with the problem that Ibn Khaldūn posed of the Bedouin as an absolutely separate element in society, who entered civilization only under certain conditions.³² Ibn Khaldūn's theory of history was clearly on the mind of al-Ṭaḥṭāwī when he read Montesquieu, whose work he found to be very similar to the *Muqaddima*. He referred to Montesquieu as the Ibn Khaldūn of the West.³³

The study of Islamic works on geography and history had first been revived in Turkey in the late eighteenth century in connection with the needs

of the military. A number of Western works were translated into Turkish at that time as well. A number of these works were later reprinted at Bülâq during the Muḥammad 'Alī period, some in Turkish and some in Arabic, and for the same reason. In general, as Lane stated, the knowledge of physical geography among the Egyptians was very low, owing in part to the lack of maps.³⁴ Al-'Aṭṭār and al-Taḥṭāwī were among the main students of geography in Egypt, and they had had contact with the Turkish studies in these fields. For both of them, however, the factor of personal travel, more than that of military reform, informed their interest in geography. Al-'Aṭṭār wrote in the introduction to the Bülâq edition of the *Takhlīs*, in praise of the book, that it should make any reasonable man seek to travel from country to country until he arrived at certain knowledge. The importance of the *Takhlīs*, he stated, lay in the fact that there was no other work in Arabic on the history of Paris.³⁵

As in the case of history and literature, al-Taḥṭāwī had received training in the rationalist tradition of classical geography from al-'Aṭṭār, who had read with him the classical texts and had written explanatory notes in the margins. Al-Taḥṭāwī is the witness to this, and it is confirmed by literary evidence.³⁶ He obviously relied on these works which he studied with al-'Aṭṭār. "Kitāb taqwīm al-buldān" formed the basis of one section of his own work, *Bidāyat al-quḍamā* (1838).³⁷ The other sources which he used were European. In turning to these marginal notes to read the comments of al-'Aṭṭār, one finds an example of a rational-deductive approach (à la Abū'l-Fidā') adjusting to European positivism. Abū'l-Fidā' had mentioned Germany, which, he stated, was an unknown region. Al-'Aṭṭār commented that this may have been the case for the Greeks, "but in our time we know it east and west," from knowledge which the Greeks did not possess. On the same page he translates *farḍikh* into miles and refers to information on the size of the earth and the height of some mountains.³⁸

Al-'Aṭṭār made some other comments which reveal his familiarity with the Westernized Turkish geographical tradition. In a discussion of the West Indies (al-Hind al-Gharbiya), he referred in particular to a work entitled "Yeni dünya" (New World), which was apparently an atlas and a history book. His reaction to it, however, was rather reserved. He concluded that the theory of seven continents was still compatible with the "fundamental" division of north and south.³⁹

The influence of Abū'l-Fidā' on al-'Aṭṭār and al-Taḥṭāwī was greater in geography than in astronomy. Al-'Aṭṭār remarked that the astronomical data found in the "Kitāb taqwīm al-buldān" were now contained in works on 'ilm al-hay'a, although he did not absolutely reject the traditional unity of these fields. Similarly, when al-Taḥṭāwī discussed European geographical writing, he called it 'ilm al-hay'a al-dunyawi, or hay'a of this world, implying that he judged it in terms of the "Kitāb taqwīm."⁴⁰

The same held true of al-Taḥṭāwī's astronomical discussions in the *Takhlīs*, but by 1835 he had turned against Ptolemaic astronomy. For example, in the *Takhlīs* he wrote, concerning map making in Paris, that a similar

operation could be found in Ptolemy. Where European theories diverged, he expressed some doubts, for example, on the rotation of the earth. "When it is morning in Paris, it is noon in Cairo."⁴¹

Al-Taḥṭāwī broke decisively with the Ptolemaic view in a work on *'ilm al-hay'a* (that is, geography and astronomy) which was completed in 1835, in which he translated portions of geography books on Europe and the rest of the world, concluding with a section on astronomy. His source for the latter was Isaac Newton, and he made no effort to reconcile contradictory traditions.⁴²

Despite the Islamic intellectual formation of al-Taḥṭāwī, the *Takhliṣ* was poorly received among conservatives in al-Azhar and elsewhere. This is not surprising. Lane recorded an observation on October 27, 1834, of a conversation in a bookstore where it was described as "his voyage from Alexandria to Marseilles; how he got drunk on board the ship and was tied to the mast and flogged; that he ate pork in the land of infidelity and obstinacy, and that it is a most excellent meat; how he was delighted with the French girls, and how superior they were in charms to the women of Egypt; and having qualified himself, by every accomplishment for an eminent place in Hell, returned to his native country."⁴³

In this brief, brilliant anecdote, Lane evokes the latent social conflict between the ruling class and the suppressed middle class. Al-Taḥṭāwī had written a *riḥla*; he had, in fact, abandoned the structure and style of the familiar pietistic *riḥla* in all but name, in favor of the secular, geographical studies favored by the Ottoman ruling class. In the view of one student, what attracted him most was the genre favored by seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Ottoman diplomats who, having traveled to Europe, sat down to write about their experiences.⁴⁴

The Integration of Egypt into the World Market and the Development of Modern Culture: A Brief Sketch

The third phase in the development of modern culture in Egypt can be conveniently dated from the generation after the Land Law of 1837, during the age of Isma'il in the mid-1860's, the period characterized by the integration of Egypt into the world market. The age of Isma'il witnessed the creation of a new historical formation and the growth of a bourgeois society based on landownership and trade. This class was composed largely of Europeans, members of minorities, and Turks, but it also included a steadily growing number of Egyptian Muslims. The Europeans and minorities were representatives of the international trading community which controlled the Egyptian economy and dominated Egyptian politics. The Turks and Egyptians served mainly in the bureaucracy, the court, or the educational system. Underneath this class was the much larger local middle class composed primarily of Egyptian merchants and artisans and, in the 1860's, rural nota-

bles.⁴⁵ This class manifested its power in cultural expression and in the continuing opposition to "reform" on the part of al-Azhar.

In cultural fields, the changed historical context, one of economic dependence of not only the monarchy but also the rest of the ruling class on Europe, found expression in a fragmented, assimilative approach to knowledge, whether European or Islamic. Māturīdite theology was now expressed predominantly in *ḥadīth* studies by the leading reformers, who continued to support neoclassicism. As in the Muḥammad 'Alī period, the works in various fields which were based on religious modalities were no longer an outgrowth of "religious" research, for example, in *ḥadīth* chains. This syncretic empiricism was now dissociated from *ḥadīth* studies and was dominated by a secular content. The expansion of the fragmented secular sphere caused a sense of dislocation, and this feeling of dislocation led the young Muḥammad 'Abdu to write his *Risālat al-tawḥīd*.

The main writers of this period were Shaykh Ḥusayn al-Marṣaṭī in language sciences, the prose writer Ibrāhīm al-Muwayliḥī, the poet Sāmī al-Bārūdī, 'Alī Mubārak in history, and al-Ṭaḥṭāwī. All these writers contributed formally to educational and cultural reform; all opposed the *kalām* of the Muḥammad 'Alī period; all tended in varying degrees toward the nascent positivism now embodied again in *ḥadīth* studies, although this development was blocked by the imposition of Aristotelianism in aesthetics.

This chapter showed the continuation of neoclassicism as the dominant form of Egyptian culture, embodied in the writings of Ḥasan al-Aṭṭār and his students. Neoclassicism's originality lay in the scholarship which unearthed appropriate models for an agrarian age and in the creative imitation of these models. The task of the scholars who served in the editorial and journalistic positions of the reform era was one of critically appropriating the fruits of the eighteenth-century revival while turning away from its cultural ethos, its aesthetics, and its logic. The task of appropriation was inescapable because the early nineteenth century also marked a continuation toward the development of a modern culture, a culture of capitalism. The rising critical consciousness of the eighteenth century, the early utilitarianism, and the sentiments of patriotism found a more or less direct continuation in the reform period. Despite the structural change from a more inductive to a more deductive basis for religious thought, positivism was becoming more and more clearly the epistemological foundation of upper-class intellectual life. Conflicts in language reform likewise had their eighteenth-century antecedents. The middle-class interest in realism, whether in the writing of *maqāmāt* or in the technical translations, had important precedents in the work of the *majālīs*. The struggle against the agrarian monarchical flattery of *saj'* was actually more advanced in the eighteenth century than in the Muḥammad 'Alī period, which was a period of general cultural decline. In the final chapter we shall conclude our discussion of neoclassicism by surveying the sciences in which its development was totally thwarted by a more precipitous transition to bourgeois culture, rendering it irrelevant far earlier than in cultural fields.

Chapter 9

The World Market as a Limiting Factor in the Development of Neoclassicism: The Case of Science and Medicine

In the first phase of its revival, neoclassicism was the dominant expression of an economically powerful sector of the economy. It served the function of rationalization and legitimization of the Mamlūk-rich merchant ruling class's orientation in the broadest sense. In the second phase, neoclassicism had a more limited role. It served to legitimize the ruling class by creating an approach to history, language, literature, and science to fit its needs. Neoclassicism in this phase was the product of a small number of religious and literary figures who were themselves part of but marginal to the ruling structure which they sought to legitimize. They were among the worst paid, and their skills were not highly respected. The reasons for this derived not from ethnicity, but rather from the structure of the world market and the development of the internal dynamics. The dominant class was sufficiently strong not to require neoclassicism in science as an ideological foil. This class, following Western tutelage and being interested in distancing itself from both the Mamlūks and the eighteenth-century Egyptian scholars, repudiated its immediate ancestry as decadent and as responsible for the present backwardness of society. It followed that they too saw Islam's true glory now to be in the distant past; but, in contrast to figures like al-'Aṭṭār, they had less interest in the study of the past to find what was useful in it.

In accepting Western technology, this class came increasingly to accept the West's evaluation of all aspects of its history. Thus, there were limits to the role which was defined for neoclassicism, far more than there had been during the previous period. The effect of al-'Aṭṭār's extraordinary rediscovery of Ibn al-Nafīs on the Egyptians trained as doctors can only be imagined. Perhaps it stirred romantic feelings, perhaps a sense of ambivalence.

Did the collapse of neoclassicism which accompanied the change in the structure of the ruling class signify a break in the continuity of Egyptian cultural history? Did the abrupt political changes brought about by the Muḥammad 'Alī regime have their counterpart in a sudden break in cultural continuity? This was not the case. Cultural life did not, of course, depend totally on the state. The individual scholars who lived in this transitional age provided continuity through their work. But, first, the state itself depended on a complex religious and juridical framework, just as it operated within a given level of technology. Even in an era dominated by *kalām*, it was necessary for scholars to teach *ḥadīth* and to maintain competence in it, not only for polemical reasons but also for liturgical and scholarly re-

quirements. In addition, there was the question of the structural relationship of the *'ulamā'* to the dominant class. In all three eras which we deal with here, the *'ulamā'* lived from the patronage of the wealthy, but their relationship to the ruling class was a marginal one. This was true even of those who were favored by the regime. It is natural that they retained, if not an actual independence, at least a range of values and concerns which were potentially in conflict with the regime. This had a bearing on cultural continuity. Second, given the less than homogeneous character of the ruling class, the activities of the state were far from being a clear reflection of any group. Those working in cultural fields certainly were in no position to challenge the policies of the state, but in small ways—as in the choice of certain books to be translated or printed at Bulāq, or in the decision of al-ʿAṭṭār to continue teaching Andalusian literature—the existence of the cultural structure allowed both a dominant orientation and several subordinate, divergent trends. The intervening complexity of the cultural structure itself thus helped to overcome the chasm left by a switch from a revival based on *ḥadīth* studies in the eighteenth century to one based in *kalām* in the nineteenth century.

In contrast to fields which developed more directly out of religious studies, medicine and sciences had also to justify their existence in European terms. The expansion of the world market required a level of technique which only existed in Europe. What Europe needed was encouraged. It is not too strong to say that in science and medicine Islamic emulation of European science was suppressed, even if it emanated from the intellectual elite.

The "suppression" of neoclassicism in science and medicine deserves clarification. The writings which we discuss below are important documents from the perspective of the history of science and culture. They are still unpublished, although they were written by Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār, who was in favor in the regime and had some measure of power. Politically they were consistent with the main trends of thought which the regime was following. In fact, they were major intellectual labors, especially his main work in medicine and the work in geometry. Yet they were not published and there is no indication that a struggle occurred in which al-ʿAṭṭār's writings were suppressed, in a formal sense.

Cultural production was, as the result of the state-owned printing facilities, a matter of policy. The publication of neoclassical works in medicine would be ingratiating to the suppressed merchant artisanal milieu; it might even be taken as a sign of weakness. It might not be understood by the Europeans.

In Morocco, a student of the new medical school in Egypt did publish such a work, but the situation of the reform movement in early nineteenth-century Morocco was much more precarious than it was in Egypt. It should not be argued that these writings would not have been of any scientific use. In eighteenth-century Istanbul even Europeans had acknowledged the utility of classical Islamic science, at least as elementary textbooks. Doctors

coming to Egypt throughout the Muḥammad 'Alī period were interested in the indigenous knowledge. While Europeans might not accept Islamic science as a replacement for their own textbooks, classical texts could have found a place in the curriculum.

If a residual classicism, exemplified in medicine by the tradition of Ibn Sīnā, could be tolerated, why could not a neoclassical critique of Ibn Sīnā be tolerated in a period when clearly the hold of Ibn Sīnā was waning? Were the later generations of Ottoman doctors ignorant of Western clinical medicine? A survey of the printed sources for this period suggests the opposite. The Ottoman Muslim medical elite was always aware of trends in the West through translations of leading works. In al-'Aṭṭār's period, doctors of different nationalities met regularly in the Istanbul hospitals. A more probable explanation for the continuing influence of Ibn Sīnā was the cultural formation of the medical profession in this period. The vast majority were Sūfis, members of the Sharī'a-minded orders like the Naqshbandis, who drew their clientele from the upper classes.

From the renaissance to the late eighteenth century, doctors of the Near East could accommodate the findings of physical medicine in Ibn Sīnā's framework. With the decisive transformation in the West which Michel Foucault termed the rise of clinical medicine—or what we have termed in a more general sense positivism—arose a crisis in metaphysics. This crisis is reflected in the arguments over medical procedure among Europeans and between Europeans and among Middle Easterners. Arguments concerning medical procedure were thus very much reflected by one's relation to the industrial revolution.

The question which I posed concerning the rejection of neoclassicism cannot be answered in terms of differences existing in the field of medicine between Istanbul and Cairo. Until the middle of the eighteenth century, the ruling Turkish military group relied on classical physical medicine and were probably less aware of the West than the ruling class in Istanbul. In the middle of the eighteenth century there were two significant changes. The influx of European refugees, some of whom became Mamlūks, mercenaries, or merchant adventurers, included a number of doctors. Of these several were quite reputable; several others were not. One killed his patients as a favor to his chief patron. With the rise of this new group of doctors, there ceased to be Mamlūk patronage in physical medicine for Muslim Egyptians. This was noticeable by 1770, when several hospitals virtually fell into disuse. Therefore, Egyptian medical work turned from physical medicine to spiritual medicine; often this took the form of group therapy under the aegis of the leading Sūfi *shaykhs*.

The change in the social composition of the profession of physical medicine did not have the dramatic effects which one might expect. The same was not true in the area of military technology. There Western advisors played an important and transformative role from the eighteenth century onward. From a medical standpoint, European progress was less certain: the Napoleonic invasion of Egypt was a disaster. Of the 24,000 soldiers who

evacuated Egypt, it is estimated that 2,400 already had ophthalmia or were blind. Even the savants came to respect "folk remedies," as they were known, and actively solicited advice in areas like veterinary medicine, following the impressive show of the Mamlūk cavalry.

Al-ʿAṭṭār stands at something of a distance from these events, having passed a number of years in Turkey where he studied medicine. In Turkey he learned the Ibn Sīnā tradition which had been available before his time in Egypt, a tradition which one could call the classicist tradition. In addition he came in contact with other traditions of physical medicine, Islamic and Western, which contradicted Ibn Sīnā, and he saw their utility. But neither he nor even the European doctors in Egypt in his lifetime totally abandoned Ibn Sīnā. What was taking place was the transformation within a part of the ruling class which was shifting from a physical medicine based in religious metaphysics to one rooted in a secular positivism. The opposition of the suppressed middle classes to all the sciences, as manifested in their opposition to quarantine, an opposition defended by logic, continued through the Muḥammad ʿAlī period.

Since the sixteenth century, when syphilis reached the Ottoman Empire from Europe, Istanbul was a center of medicine which remained in contact with the West. This is manifested in the series of translations from European languages into Turkish. In the contacts between Jewish, Armenian, and Turkish doctors, a direct link with Europe was sustained. Turkish doctors who reached high positions in the Ottoman Empire were frequently reformers. They often belonged to the Naqshbandī and Khalwatī Ṣūfī orders. They traveled to Istanbul for their education, as many did from Damascus in the eighteenth century. In the provincial capitals of the empire, the medical establishments were much smaller than in Istanbul. Prior to the middle of the eighteenth century, the minorities are not mentioned in medical history of Ottoman Cairo; but with the commercial revival, the Mamlūks switched to Greeks and Jews exclusively, and permitted the Muslim hospitals, Māristān al-Manṣūrī, to decline. The last Egyptian writings on anatomy in the eighteenth century date from mid-century.

The sudden growth of European influence in physical medicine was not the result of European success in dealing with the age-old local ailments. Eye diseases which plagued Egypt had their traditional remedies and these were used by European and Muslim alike through the Napoleonic period until the 1820's. Napoleon's doctors tried desperately to stop the spread of blindness from bienorrheal ophthalmia with dry collyria (*kuhl* and *shishm*). Europeans in Egypt were equally confused about what response to take to the plague. The chief doctor, Clot Bey, opposed the theory of contagion, but Muḥammad ʿAlī, concerned for his army and his family's welfare, advocated it. It is interesting that one of the textbooks used in the Medical School of Clot Bey should quote Ibn Sīnā.

With the expulsion of Egyptians from physical medicine, it is not surprising to find that the great achievements of Egyptians in the eighteenth century were in the area of spiritual medicine, particularly areas which

resemble forms of group therapy. Middle Eastern concern with dream interpretation, with music, with water treatments, and with lasting relationships between healer and healed was not recognized by nineteenth-century Western Europeans as science. This was a period when Western psychology was particularly sterile. The talismanic significance of ritual, the giving and receiving of names, the dialectical interpenetration of the well and the sick would have to await an observer like Jung.

The traditions of travel and study permitted the Ottomans to sustain an intellectual division of labor. Those Egyptians like Hasan al-Jabartī or Muḥammad ibn 'Arafa al-Disūqī who wanted rational sciences traveled to Istanbul or elsewhere. In the early nineteenth century this was continued by Hasan al-'Aṭṭār. Al-'Aṭṭār's work catches not merely the corrections integrated into the traditional corpus of Galen and Ibn Sīnā but also the breakdown of the traditional structure under the blows of positivism, as evidenced in the empirical study of anatomy.¹

Hasan al-'Aṭṭār's "Sharḥ Nuzha": A Turning Point in the History of Arabic Medical Writing

Hasan al-'Aṭṭār wrote his main book on medicine in Syria in 1814. It was the most important work on medicine in the Arab world in the early nineteenth century and is perhaps the first work by an Arab to discuss the modern study of anatomy.² It preceded the systematic study of the Turk Shani Zadeh by some six years and the "official" beginning of modern medical history in his own country by ten years or more. The form of the work was to a large extent dictated by the literary and pedagogical style of the era. It was a commentary on a text by al-Anṭākī. Al-'Aṭṭār's commentary occupies more than four hundred pages and covers an enormous range of subjects. It is also a major document of neoclassicism.

The "Nuzha," the shortest of Dā'ūd al-Anṭākī's three main works on medicine, and probably the least known, is an essay containing material for which "the well-informed will need no further elongation." The principal source was Ibn Sīnā, who is referred to numerous times as simply "our *shaykh*." Certain occult sciences not in the *Qānūn* are also discussed; for example, the first main topic treated by al-Anṭākī was the Three Kingdoms of Nature.³ Unlike the *Tadhkara*, which was in the tradition of the medical formulary of Ibn al-Bayṭār, the "Nuzha" was, al-'Aṭṭār pointed out, a mixture and, furthermore, an uncritical one. Dā'ūd al-Anṭākī was a student of *ḥadīth*, as his medicine shows.⁴

Al-'Aṭṭār chose not to take on the *Tadhkara* directly; rather, he chose another of al-Anṭākī's works. For, as he said, the *Tadhkara* of Dā'ūd was the fundamental work on medicine (*'umda wa imām*), at least among the *'ulamā'*.⁵ He claims that he had been prepared to accept the evaluation until he read some of the predecessors of Dā'ūd al-Anṭākī in medicine and *al-hikma*. Their writings showed that Dā'ūd's were very confused and in fact

had little value at all. Concerning the *Tadhkara* itself, there is little that is worthwhile, except simple remedies and some treatments which he copied from the books of the ancients. His account of the humours in the introduction, based on mystical sources, is "worthless"; his decision to include in the introduction information on *al-handasa* and *al-hay'a* is "not according to the practice of doctors." However, "the times" were not suitable for a real onslaught on al-Anṭākī.⁶

Perhaps what is most remarkable about al-ʿAṭṭār's critique is the sources which he himself used, sources which were thought to have been lost to later Arabic medicine. These included the "Sharḥ al-qānūn" of Ibn al-Nafīs (died 1288) and the "Sharḥ qānūnjā" of ʿAbd al-Laṭīf al-Baghdādī. In the former work, Ibn al-Nafīs sets out a theory of the lesser, or pulmonary, circulation of the blood, contradicting Ibn Sīnā and anticipating Harvey. With a couple of minor exceptions, this theory has not been found in other books, leading me, in the light of "Sharḥ nuzha," to revise my understanding of the role of anatomy in Arab medical education.⁷

The main work in which Ibn al-Nafīs expressed his ideas on the circulation of the blood was "Sharḥ al-qānūn," the relevant portions of which were assembled in a derivative work called "Sharḥ tashrīḥ al-qānūn." This has led to some confusion because his other work, "Sharḥ mūʾjaz al-qānūn," sometimes called "Sharḥ mukhtaṣar," does not contain this material. In "Sharḥ al-qānūn," Ibn al-Nafīs wrote: "When the blood has been refined in the right ventricle, it needs be that it pass to the left ventricle, where the vital spirit is generated. But between these two there exists no passageway, for the substance of the heart there is solid and there exists neither a visible passage, as some writers have thought, nor an invisible passage which will permit the flow of blood as Galen believed. But on the contrary, the pores of the heart are shut, and its substance there is thick. But this blood, after being refined, must of necessity pass along the pulmonary artery into the lung."⁸

Al-ʿAṭṭār obviously read some passage such as this, but he misunderstood the author's intent. He appears to have thought that Ibn al-Nafīs denied the above contention. "This is the view of al-Qurashī [Ibn al-Nafīs], and it is incorrect, for the heart has two internal ventricles only, one of which is filled with blood, and it is on the right side. The other is filled with vital spirit [rūḥ] and it is on the left side. There is absolutely no passageway between the two, nor does the blood penetrate into the side of the spirit, and thereby correct its essence. Dissection makes a lie of what they have said [al-ʿAṭṭār concludes with a contrast between the heart in larger and smaller animals]."⁹

Despite this curious involution of the ideas of Ibn al-Nafīs, it is obvious enough that the tradition of Ibn al-Nafīs was known in Turkey in the circles of the Hakimbashi where al-ʿAṭṭār studied. This information alone justifies a new study of the tradition of Ibn al-Nafīs. Such a study would surely revise the prevailing image of the dominance of Ibn Sīnā. It might also add something to our knowledge of the curious Western figure Michael Servetus, the

unexplained forerunner of Harvey. Another example of al-ʿAṭṭār's familiarity with the history of Islamic medicine is his use of al-Rāzī to justify dissection. Like Ibn al-Nafīs, al-Rāzī represented a critique of the Ibn Sīnā tradition of medicine. Al-Rāzī represented the development of an empirical approach, an experimental method in science and medicine, and opposition to the purely deductive approach or to the search for integration through symbolic meaning.¹⁰

In later years, when al-ʿAṭṭār was securely part of the upper class, he did not need to veil his opinions. In 1830 he wrote that, while Ibn Sīnā was the great doctor of the theory of medicine, al-Rāzī was the great practitioner. The distinction was itself significant, especially because of his linking practice to dissection, and his obvious preference for practice as opposed to theory. "He was Muḥammad al-Ṭabīb [the physician] al-Rāzī, who preceded Ibn Sīnā, and a biography of him was written by the author of the *Tabaqāt al-aṭibbāʾ*. Al-Rāzī wrote many books, some of which can still be found in our country, and some of which I have read. I found that he had done extensive work on treatment, in contrast to Ibn Sīnā. Ibn Sīnā's skill was in theory and not in practice. Perhaps that was because he did not personally engage very much in practice, as the rest of the doctors did, because he was involved in affairs of state and held many positions. He encountered many miseries, making his writings unique as he composed them in flight or in hiding or moving from one place to another."¹¹

This was written in the secure context of the Muḥammad ʿAlī era. But the same thought underlay his comments in "Sharḥ nuzha" (1813), because al-Anṭākī was no more than a continuator of Ibn Sīnā in many respects. In "Sharḥ nuzha," al-ʿAṭṭār stressed how important was the knowledge of empirical anatomy for diagnosis in internal medicine, as well as was knowledge of the essential nature of each organ and its function.¹² Al-ʿAṭṭār also stressed the importance of experimentation and mentioned several experiments, including his own failure to keep a servant boy alive. In the preceding folio, he said that in the past Muslim doctors explained the climax of an illness as God's will, or they claimed that it depended on the moon and stars. Al-ʿAṭṭār stated that he witnessed an experiment tending to disprove the latter.¹³ In rehabilitating the more empirical tradition of science and medicine, al-ʿAṭṭār made yet another attack on the Ahl al-Hadīth by showing that what was meant by "Arab medicine" did not mean Arab in any narrow sense but included all those who worked in the Arab lands, especially at the time of the ʿAbbāsīd Caliphate, who received the tradition of Greek medicine translated into Arabic.¹⁴ Finally, al-ʿAṭṭār relied on his own experience, implying that this was surer than what he had read in the earlier books.

Al-ʿAṭṭār offered in particular some opinions based on his travels as to the healthfulness of living in the wind, or in a moist place, or at a high altitude. He likewise made a number of comparisons of different climates and related them to public baths in Syria, Istanbul, and Cairo.¹⁵ Al-ʿAṭṭār also showed some knowledge of Egypt which he must have acquired in his youth, for

example, of folk habits of the *riḥ* (countryside of Egypt) and of the people of Rashīd and the Delta, and of the different climatic regions of Egypt.¹⁶ A last area of criticism which al-ʿAṭṭār began in the "*Sharḥ nuzha*" was his attack on the tradition of *al-ḥikma* for its vagueness and inaccuracy.

I now return to the question of the "circumstances" which made it ill-advised for al-ʿAṭṭār to undertake an attack on al-Anṭākī and, more generally, what were al-ʿAṭṭār's accomplishments in medicine prior to his return to Egypt. The commentary on al-Anṭākī reflected part of the steadily evolving elite transformation as it was emerging in medicine and science in the Ottoman Empire. Al-ʿAṭṭār's position when he wrote "*Tuḥfat gharīb al-waṭan*" and when he wrote the "*Sharḥ nuzha*" was that of an *ʿālim* seeking the patronage of the ruling class. "*Sharḥ nuzha*" was an attack on the Ahl al-Ḥadīth. Daʿūd al-Anṭākī, like Nūr al-dīn al-Ashmūnī in grammar, was a symbol in this sense of a contemporary reality rather than simply a figure from the past.

The criticism of Ibn Sīnā was more implicit than explicit. It sufficed for al-ʿAṭṭār to show an apparent harmony of outlook among Ibn al-Naḥs, al-Rāzī, and the European medicine with which he came in contact. While he was prepared to admit that Ibn Sīnā made mistakes in detail which attention to dissection would have prevented, it was impossible for him, given the historical context of rationalism within which he was functioning, to abandon his belief in the validity of a rational-deductive approach to the understanding of medicine. In the second phase of the neoclassical revival, al-ʿAṭṭār was prepared to demonstrate more and more mistakes in the writings of Ibn Sīnā, but he was indisposed to break with the philosophical orientation which caused these errors.¹⁷

Al-ʿAṭṭār and the Recovery of the Tradition of ʿIlm al-Hayʾa

Between the sixteenth and the eighteenth centuries, both Turkey and Egypt engaged in a range of scientific activities according to their needs. Turkish science in particular is known for its influence on work in Europe in areas like mathematics. Napoleon charged four of his scientists to examine the mills in Egypt.

By the eighteenth century, the contacts were much more numerous, but the Ottoman contribution in science and technology was of less importance. In eighteenth-century Egypt, the changing policy of the Mamluks affected Egyptian scientists as it had Egyptian doctors. Several *ʿulamāʾ* who were denied patronage in the physical sciences turned to a revival of *al-ḥikma*, distinguishing themselves from the dominant concern with *al-mīqāt*. The revival of *al-ḥikma*, particularly one part of it, *ʿilm al-hayʾa*, was important to nineteenth-century writers like al-ʿAṭṭār who sought to arrive at a positivist philosophy of science through indigenous lines of thought. The background to al-ʿAṭṭār's writings included two types of writ-

ings, one on the meaning of scientific terminology and the other concerned with the sorting of different types of matter.

Al-ʿAṭṭār's Critique of the Study of al-Ḥikma in the Eighteenth Century

During the reform period, al-ʿAṭṭār carried on an intellectual campaign to defend the legitimacy of science in the eyes of the *ʿulamāʾ* and to attract the attention of the ruling class to the Islamic tradition of science.¹⁸ In this campaign, he defended *al-ḥikma* against those who attacked its rationalist inclinations. Thereafter, he criticized it from the vantage point of positivist science.

Some people, said al-ʿAṭṭār, probably referring to the Ahl al-Ḥadīth of his own day, say that

unrestricted investigation, or plunging, into *al-ḥikma* is risky and thus forbidden, but this is only partially true because researchers in *al-ḥikma* who are expert in Qurʾān and *sunna* strengthen their understanding thereby . . . because they have a pious means to answer those with false doctrines and to refute misguided beliefs. *Al-ḥikma* provides a source of knowledge of the technical vocabulary which the later *ʿulamāʾ* in *ʿilm al-kalām* invented [or at least thought to be new]. No one has said that this [last] was forbidden, and perhaps it is even among the religious obligations. . . . The first thing in this field which man may profit from in this discipline is the capacity to make a suitable reply and thereby to make the truth triumph. For this reason, later scholars like Fakhr al-dīn al-Rāzī, Ḥujjat al-Islām al-Ghazzālī and others of the innumerable geniuses and distinguished scholars have carried on their research in *al-ḥikma*. As for those with stupid minds, simple thoughts, and naïve natures, such as would lack the sciences of the sacred law which should guide research, . . . *al-ḥikma* is forbidden to him. . . . We say that research in it is similar to research in logic. There is no doubt that one who seeks to resolve such problems would be working on important matters of the greatest seriousness and benefit, as in the Shaykh al-ʿIqlīmī's commentary on "Al-Jāmī' al-Ṣaghīr." . . . Indeed, a certain number of eminent persons of the later period, such as the Imām Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, al-Nawawī, and others, who were also poets, forbade the sciences of *al-ḥikma*, even in the purely logical aspects. Another group which investigated the matter concluded that adherence to one of these two positions obliges censure of the other. We might add by way of interpretation that "he who raises the cloth, removes the secrets, makes clear the right path."¹⁹

Having established a fundamental legitimacy for the existence of the field (largely in terms of its relationship to logic) and having dealt with certain linguistic considerations which were, of course, not central to the study of *al-ḥikma* itself, al-ʿAṭṭār proceeded to criticize it more or less for the same

reasons for which he praised it, that is, that *al-ḥikma* is composed of many aspects, some of which are useful to the well informed but others are misguided. Al-'Aṭṭār never dealt with the proposition that *al-ḥikma* rested on a higher unity than the sum of its parts. He dealt with it only in terms of merits of its various parts.

Al-ḥikma, he said, was traditionally divided into three general categories: *al-ṭabī'yāt*, *al-riyāḍiyyāt*, and *al-ilahīyyāt*. He thought that research on *al-ilahīyyāt*, subjects such as the attributes and existence of God, was impossible. Much of the research performed in *al-riyāḍiyyāt* likewise dealt with imaginary subjects (*umūr mawḥūma*), such as the domain of the stars (*al-dawā'ir al-fālakiya*) and the theory of numbers ('*add*). Furthermore, research on *al-riyāḍiyyāt*, he claimed, had not served the needs of the community; Al-'Aṭṭār cited in particular its inability to predict the times of eclipses. He said that this had had a bad effect on the Muslim community and on the maintenance of the Divine command. Such problems, he concluded, are rightly the province of *al-handasa*.²⁰ His criticism of the study of *riyāḍiyyāt* in *al-ḥikma* was pursued further in his major work on *uṣūl al-dīn*, which was published in 1830.

And I say, concerning the subject of the vacuum and other branches of the physical sciences, that their investigation will uncover strange secrets; this is necessary in the fields of mechanics, gravity (*jarr al-athqāl*), and force (*ḥayl*) and for other unfamiliar inventions. Recently books have been translated into Arabic containing numerous matters of great precision. I read some of these, deducing that they were based on application of the principles of geometry (*al-handasa*) and the physical sciences, both on the level of theory and on the level of practice. . . . In these books, one finds discussed military technology and fire-throwing apparatus, which is explained systematically, until the field becomes a separate discipline, possessing its own subdivisions. He who pursues the reading of these unusual books will learn a great deal about sound science, the study of which is essential to the completion of one's education.²¹

That this passage was located in a work on the religious sciences by the Shaykh al-Azhar underscores the fact that the regime's outlook opposed heretical and "misguided" orientation, even in science, which could be linked implicitly to *ḥadīth* studies and possibly to heterodox mystical theology. The idea of "separate disciplines," as opposed to mere subdivisions, shows the influence of Western positivism.

In his study of medicine, al-'Aṭṭār had a forthright criticism of the role of *al-ḥikma*. He clearly preferred the tradition of the "doctors" to the tradition of the "*ḥukama*" in medicine. He ridiculed dream interpretation, saying that it was entirely based on surmise and varied from one doctor to another.²² He also dismissed the contribution of astrology (*raml* and *zā'irā*) to medicine. In his most important book on *al-ḥikma*, the *Ḥaṣḥiya 'ala sharḥ al-Balidī* (1818/1234), al-'Aṭṭār discussed problems in the field of as-

tronomy. It was his intention to criticize certain claims made by Ibn Sīnā which were unverified. In doing so, he drew on the Safavid writer Bahā' al-dīn al-ʿĀmilī. Al-ʿAṭṭār stated that there was no proof for the existence of the ninth starless heaven of Ibn Sīnā, according to al-ʿĀmilī.²³ Following this is al-ʿĀmilī's criticism of Ibn Sīnā on another point: Al-ʿĀmilī stated on the subject of the rotation of the stars that, contrary to Ibn Sīnā, most do not go from east to west.

In addition to the writings of al-ʿAṭṭār on *al-ḥikma*, there were also the writings of his colleague and friend Sami Bey, some of which appeared in the editorials of *Al-Waqāʾiʿ al-Miṣriyya*, which he was editing. His intention in writing on *al-ḥikma* appeared to be to defend it as a spiritually unifying force. He wrote an autobiographical fragment in one issue in which he mentioned the mystical education of his youth.²⁴

Al-ʿAṭṭār and the Revival of ʿilm al-Hayʿa

Al-ʿAṭṭār's principal aim in rejecting *al-ḥikma* was not the destruction of *al-ḥikma* per se but the discovery of an approach to science which would bring satisfactory results. This he finally found in the field of *ʿilm al-hayʿa*, although he was not fully able to keep separate its two orientations: the one in astronomy, the other in mystical philosophy. The most accessible of the two was mystical philosophy, which had ultimately originated in the *Rasāʾil* of the Ikhwān al-Ṣafāʾ. It was, however, the field of *ʿilm al-hayʿa* as an empirically based science that basically interested al-ʿAṭṭār.²⁵ Al-ʿAṭṭār's confusions in this field arose as a result of his introduction to it through the writings of Bahā' al-dīn al-ʿĀmilī. Al-ʿĀmilī represented a mixture of both traditions, but more so than not he was a spiritual descendant of the Ikhwān al-Ṣafāʾ.²⁶

Al-ʿAṭṭār's main work on natural science represented an effort to clarify the relationship between the astronomy represented by Qāḍī Zadeh and Nāṣir al-dīn al-Tūsī, on the one hand, and of al-ʿĀmilī, on the other: the tradition of astronomy which was studied in the astronomical observatories of postclassical Islam as opposed to astronomy through philosophy. The work was begun before al-ʿAṭṭār left Cairo, but most of it was written in Turkey, and it was completed in 1831/1237 after his return to Cairo.²⁷ The text, with the commentary of Qāḍī Zadeh, was traditionally widely read in connection with the study of *al-miqāt*, which required a knowledge of the fundamental principles of Euclidian geometry.

Al-ʿAṭṭār's intentions in writing this work were apparently quite similar to his intentions in writing the "Sharḥ nuzha" in medicine. One can see, in his choice of a basic text in the natural sciences of the Ahl al-Hadīth, elements of class conflict, theological struggle, and conflict within the confines of secular knowledge itself. Neoclassicism was a weapon which undermined the traditional authorities and pointed to a reconciliation between earlier Islamic sources and contemporary Western science.

It is thus not surprising to find in this book extended coverage of empiricism and rationalism in Islamic science, for example, in its description of the school of Qāḍī Zadeh at the astronomical observatory, which obviously impressed al-ʿAṭṭār. He recounted in detail the life of Qāḍī Zadeh, including material on his quarrels with al-Jurjānī and on his life in Samarqand. One can tell from his gloss that this was clearly the model for *ʿilm al-hayʿa* which he had in mind, for he began his work with it and devoted much of his space to such figures as Nāṣir al-dīn al-Ṭūsī, who was also a representative of this tradition. He even presented a theological defense of Nāṣir al-dīn al-Ṭūsī, who held "Shīʿite" views. Al-ʿAṭṭār claimed that al-Ṭūsī's work on al-Imāma, which expressed a Rāfidite point of view, was written not by Nāṣir al-dīn himself, but by one of his associates after his death.²⁸

Al-ʿAṭṭār was apparently seriously misled by al-ʿĀmilī (or by other writers) in his effort to trace the Euclidian tradition of geometry in Islam and to dissociate the one side of the Pythagorean heritage in the theory of numbers from the others.²⁹ The problem arose in an acute form in spherical geometry (*ʿilm al-manāẓir*), where, following al-ʿĀmilī, he mentioned finding a useful essay based on Euclid.³⁰ Spherical geometry, however, underlay both the empirical work of the observatories in the compilation of star charts and the cosmological ideas of the Persian tradition, based on the *Rasāʾil* of the Ikhwān al-Ṣafāʾ. Al-ʿAṭṭār could not maintain the distinction, as one can tell from his discussion of the "throne and the chair."³¹

The influence of al-ʿĀmilī on al-ʿAṭṭār in plane geometry was probably less significant.³² In number theory, al-ʿAṭṭār found reason to attack al-ʿĀmilī's dependence on the *rasāʾil* of the Ikhwān. He said of their theory that their definition of number was composed of two parts: the theoretical and the practical. The theoretical is available only to certain people (*al-khawāṣṣ*), while the practical was no more than everyday mathematics.³³ Herein lay the contradiction. Al-ʿAṭṭār rejected both the mathematical and the geometrical bases of al-ʿĀmilī's theory, but he accepted the cosmological ideas which were derived from this tradition at the expense of the more empirically minded tradition of Qāḍī Zadeh. If *ʿilm al-hayʿa* was to mean science in the positivist sense, it had to reject the entire tradition based on the writings of the Ikhwān.³⁴ Why did this confusion exist? Was it due to the influence of the Wafāʾīya and their reliance on Bahāʾ al-dīn al-ʿĀmilī? Areas of ambiguity seem to be the necessary consequences of joining mystical theology with positivist science.

Toward a Sociology of Knowledge Based on the Structure of the Market

Writings on Egypt tend to stress the neat and orderly transfer of modern knowledge to Egypt that took place when Egyptian students went to study in Europe during the period of Muhammad ʿAlī. Writings on Europe in the

same period speak of the intellectual disarray, the theoretical ferment, rather than the existence of a well-defined body of knowledge. Why is none of this reflected among the returning students? Eric Hobsbawm has written of Europe in the 1830's: "Few except mathematicians will appreciate the profundity of the innovation brought into science by the theory of the functions of complex variables. . . , of the theory of groups, . . . or of vectors. . . . But even the layman can grasp the bearing of the revolution by which Lobachevsky of Russia (1826-29) and Bolyai of Hungary (1831) overthrew that most permanent of intellectual certainties, Euclid's geometry."³⁵ French mathematicians began to deal with the concept of irrational numbers. Yet during this period no such revolution was transported to Egypt or Turkey.

Theoretical ferment was unlikely in the context of a state commercial sector resisting the pull of the West. Unlike the situation in England and France, the cognitive system which prevailed on the periphery did not grant primacy to scientific knowledge but, as in the nascent capitalist societies of early modern Europe, cognitive primacy was shared between philosophical and technical knowledge. In England in the nineteenth century, scientific and technical knowledge remained largely independent of one another, while in Egypt they were fused. In Egypt, philosophical knowledge had not yet "disintegrated" into scientific knowledge, as it had by this time in England. Unlike the nascent capitalist regimes of early modern Europe, state capitalist regimes on the periphery of the modern world market, such as Egypt, Turkey, and later (to a degree) Japan, were characterized by a dominance of the rational and the conceptual over the empirical and at the same time were obliged, in the process of importing knowledge from the West, to make empirical adjustments at every phase to fit their concrete situation.³⁶

In contrast to culture at the center of the world market, culture at the periphery during the early industrial revolution was characterized by a prolonged period of neoclassicism. Neoclassicism was a two-edged sword. While it was used by the ruling class to counteract the culture of the traditional middle class, it could also undermine the intellectual justification of the ruling class by threatening to break through the artificial dichotomy of (in this case) Muslim versus Christian civilization. Where a strongly entrenched compradorial bourgeoisie could dispense with neoclassicism as a serious enterprise, it would do so—but neoclassicism would re-emerge when the power of that class waned. In fields in which indigenous scholarship was indispensable, it was transformed to fit the needs of nation building. Hobsbawm said of eastern and northern Europe in the early nineteenth century that, "in hitherto unawakened nations, the historian, the lexicographer, and the folksong collector were often the very founders of national consciousness." This point can be extended to cover Egypt as well.¹⁷

Chapter 10

Conclusion

From its inception modern capitalism depended on an international division of labor. To remove a population from farming and turn it to production at a time when the home markets were small and undeveloped one needed a world system structured to consume the products produced and to feed the workers in the new industries. What has been obscured in the conceptualization of history is the role of the periphery, the struggle of its merchants and manufacturers to maximize the opportunities that were open to them and were integral to the total process of industrial development. This study covers a period in that struggle and studies in some detail one country of the periphery. Between 1760 and 1840, Egypt attempted to retain control over her trade and not be restricted to production and consumption. It is not surprising that in merchant and government bureaucratic circles there developed in this period an indigenous "modernism" in Islamic thought stabilizing the economic situation prevailing in Egypt. The discovery of this Islamic cultural evolution in the economic context outlined above forces a reconstruction of knowledge. The common premise of no modern non-Western thought which does not ultimately derive from the West must be abandoned. The study of social struggle and cultural development in individual countries of the periphery like Egypt clearly affects the character of the overall development of the modern world.

In the first chapter an effort was made to reconstruct a picture of what eighteenth-century Egypt must have been. The body of information at our disposal has in the past led writers to conclude that this was a period of barbarism and anarchy.

In place of this traditional picture of Mamlūk Egypt as one of barbarism and incessant military strife, I found a widening section of the most productive farmland of the Egyptian delta being turned over to the production of export commodities destined for Europe. This change was accompanied by a penetration of moneylenders and monetary relations. In the city of Cairo equally important changes took place. The gradual growth of modern products available to the elite from Europe led to a generalized shift in their patronage. Large segments of the artisanate became underemployed by the end of the eighteenth century and as a result were turned into day labor. This change was one of the most important, as it brought to an end the guild structure which had characterized the medieval society.

Finally, the chapter addresses itself to the fusion of the commercial mid-

dle strata with the Mamlūk political elite, which took place throughout the later eighteenth century. Mamlūks became sleeping partners in trade and in the sale of agricultural produce to Europe as this was the new source of wealth. To accomplish this there was a breakdown in the traditional elite political structure of the Mamlūk house. Numerous Mamlūks were abandoned, that is, manumitted by their former lords as an expense.

In the place of Mamlūk warriors, the *beys* relied on mercenaries trained in the use of firearms. These they armed with European military and naval technology. The year 1760 is a useful point of departure to see this process in Egypt because the reform-minded ruler 'Alī Bey abandoned local Muslim medical, scientific, and commercial expertise, while turning to that of Mediterranean minorities. The study of rivalry and struggle commenced at this point, when the Egyptian intelligentsia and commercial elite perceived their power and influence in society deteriorating. The chapter concludes with some comments on the breakdown of the guilds, a development which led to much of the urban violence commented on in the well-known travel books of the time. In subsequent chapters dealing with the renewal of Ṣūfī orders, it became possible for the first time to show that, confronted with competition, the merchants attempted to squeeze the artisans. As a result of this, the artisans showed growing signs of turbulence. As a way of stabilizing the situation, the Azhar and other official mosque centers permitted their leading members to promote religious revival among the masses. This is never stated in so many words (and one would not expect it to be), but taken together, the comments of al-Jabartī about the lower classes and the writings of all the orthodox *shaykhs* about lower-class religious expression indicate that this is what the '*ulama*' were attempting. The type of Ṣūfism which existed in the eighteenth century was abandoned when these centers of production were themselves abandoned in the early nineteenth century.

The second chapter commences with a discussion of eighteenth-century intellectual life, which is integral to the discussion of political economy in the first chapter. By contrasting the existing legal writings for the eighteenth-century period, 1760–1790, with the period 1790–1840, I discovered that a single modality of argumentation and a single root of jurisprudence dominated each period. For the period in which merchant capital predominated, the modality of logic was induction, which was rooted in *ḥadīth*; for the period of state commercial dominance, systematic theology rooted in deductive logic enjoyed a rebirth. The fact that these changes took place purely in the logical structure of thought and not in the ideas presented meant that, in the domain of social theory, modern ideas (e.g., utilitarianism and realism) show a significant measure of continuity in their development from one period to the next, while many of the thematic expressions of these ideas (e.g., the Battle of Badr) are quite short-lived. Utilitarianism was the basis of argument in *ḥadīth* studies, which were carried on inductively according to the rules of evaluation. Utilitarianism and realism, which I take to be the dominant expressions of classical capitalism, were carried forward attached to a universalist Aristotelian logic in the subse-

quent period. Thus, once again the theory of reflection comes under attack. Change in the organization of work does not lead automatically to change in culture or in ideology, only to the restructuring of the form of argument. The incidence of trade-related statements is minimal, perhaps the number of metaphors in which mosques are compared to place of trade is somewhat greater, but they would not lead to a satisfactory explanation of a wider range of themes. The best way to approach the subject of the Şūfī revival of the eighteenth century is one in which the totality of culture within the life of the socioeconomic formation is seen as a complex structure, so that culture production can be seen at once as part of the processes of integration and reproduction of the formation (the historicist moment) and only contingently as a part of a continuum of elite culture which has its own internal logic(s). The discovery that a single modality of legal reasoning underlies a particular social formation led us to discover that the same corpus of medieval learning was subject to appropriation and re-appropriation in different ways. This was borne out in the material presented in the third chapter and thereafter.

The development of secular culture was found to buttress *ḥadīth* studies in the eighteenth century and to buttress or at least parallel studies of *kalām* in the period between 1790 and 1840. Studies in language, literature, and history supported points of contention directly affecting *ḥadīth* and indirectly affecting the way in which the classical language could be approached and understood. These studies thereby contributed to the ongoing struggle of the *muḥaddithīn*, who engaged in them with the popular orders and regime enemies. It is thus not surprising to find the same type of logic underlying the works of religious and secular culture, but what is even more striking is that, whereas in the modern industrial West of which Weber and Lukács write, secular culture emerges as a separate genre with the rise of the middle class, in the countries of the Mediterranean this is less common. It seems probable that, both in the early phases of capitalist transformation, as studied here, and in the later phase of retarded or periphery capitalist formation, the dominant genre would continue to be works of religion and culture in which the domain of the sacral interpenetrates with that of human control. Often the Western scholar influenced by his or her own model of development will look for the production of independent works of secular culture, such as histories or novels, thereby eschewing theology books with traditional-sounding titles. Such shortsightedness has impoverished the study of Egyptian, Greek, and Syrian Christian culture. If the larger framework of my study is correct, then the Greek religious manuscripts of Egypt and the other writings of the churches of the Syrian Christians of the eighteenth century must contain evidence in the area of theology of the momentous changes which the respective communities were undergoing. Embedded in these writings one would expect elements of secular culture to appear unexpectedly in the midst of discussions of scripture. In fact it would not be surprising if there was a general mystical revival accompanying the commercial struggles of the late eighteenth cen-

tury around the Mediterranean. At least this seems to be the case among Jews and Muslims in Algiers.

The principal features of the cultural revival discussed in the third chapter are that it took the form of a neoclassical revival of Islamic culture and that it increasingly emphasized utilitarian resolutions of problems, which permitted critical thought to dominate over the authoritative dispensations of the earlier Ottoman period. Taken as a whole, this sustains the thesis of Maxime Rodinson that Islamic theology had roots in the culture of capitalism. It serves as a critique of the view of the study of modern Islamic law which perceives a dichotomy between an Islamic sector of personal status and a public sector of Western derivation. This dichotomy is not the result of some inherent deficiency, but a product of colonial arrangements. Arrangements, one might note, in which Islam is used to oppress women. The development of neoclassicism in the later eighteenth century led increasingly to experimentation. Where the *Maqāmāt* of al-Ḥarīrī initially served linguistic and philological needs of the revival because of al-Ḥarīrī's own familiarity with pre-Islamic culture, the *maqāma* begins to emerge in the late eighteenth century as a prose piece of its time. A number of *maqāmāt* are recorded as having been written in the eighteenth century, a few have been located. The *Maqāma* of Hasan al-'Aṭṭār discussed in Chapter 4 and presented in an appendix contains features of the classical novel, notably plot and characterization. In this short autobiographical piece there is a noticeable realism.

The third chapter surveys the neoclassical revival in the area of philology and history. In philology, it is discovered that the half-dozen subdisciplines mentioned in classical accounts of philological education do not sustain equal prominence within the structure of any particular period. In the eighteenth century, lexicography experienced a rebirth and dominated all other branches. In the later seventeenth and mid-nineteenth centuries, style dominated, while in the eighteenth century, a consideration of style was minimal. Lexicography was of course linked to *ḥadīth* studies. One great production established the historical development of the meaning of words as certified by chains of scholars. This book, the *Tāj al-'arūs* of the Ṣūfī Muḥaddith al-Zabīdī, continues to serve in Arabic as the O.E.D. does in English. Not surprisingly, it was unpopular in the age of Muḥammad 'Alī. In that period the reassertion of logic led to an emphasis in lexicography on the structure of logically possible meanings (*al-naḥṭ* and *al-ishtiḳāq*).

In the study of eighteenth-century historical writings several larger assertions about the nature of culture in this period are sustained: notably, the idea of the interpenetration of the religious and the secular and their idea of the role of culture, as a product of a class in a condition of struggle. The principal discovery concerning the historical writing of the late eighteenth century is the focus on the subject of the Battle of Badr. In no previous period in Islamic history has the Battle of Badr been singled out for such individualized study. Also unique was the particular tack of claiming that the number of Muhammad's supporters was exaggerated, thereby demon-

strating that the Prophet of God wrested a victory against even greater odds than previously imagined. These writings, uniformly a part of the *ḥadīth* writing and research of the period, are found to be reflective of a mood of struggle among the Muslim merchants in the face of the European-minority alliance. The works on the Battle of Badr are with the writings of the Protestant merchants studied by Lucien Goldmann in their confrontation with French Absolutism in *The Hidden God: A Study of Tragic Vision in the "Pensées" of Pascal and the Tragedies of Racine*.

The third chapter concludes with an effort to interpret the best-known writing of the period, the *ʿAjaʾib* of al-Jabartī. Al-Jabartī unwittingly has contributed to the mystification of his work's significance by his lament on the lack of historical sources. In reading this work of great erudition, modern students have found it to be the product of an accidental genius working in a Dark Age, a man whose thinking came to fruition by the coming of the West. An examination of the work (or of the statements of the author as to its purpose) does not sustain the view of Western influence. Episodes of contact with the French are recorded, but the methodology and structuring of the work show the novelty of fusing two types of indigenous historical consciousness in one work. It is thus scarcely the production of a genius in a vacuum. The first type of history is the chronicle format, identified with the dominance of the older landed system of the Ottomans; the second type is the pietistic biography of the commercial middle classes, the *tarjama* of the *shaykhs*. This latter type is actually the more important as it is in this section that al-Jabartī argues his political views, that the *ʿulamāʾ* have the right to take over with the collapse of the Mamlūk Bayt. The fusion of the economic and political elites during the late eighteenth century also underlines the fusion of genres in al-Jabartī's writing and it is for this reason that al-Jabartī was not attracted to the more traditional chronicles at his disposal, some of which I also discussed.

The fourth and fifth chapters deal with the life of al-ʿAṭṭār, a figure of importance as a link between the culture of the eighteenth century and its continuation in the reform period of Muḥammad ʿAlī. These chapters also suggest a resolution to some general problems of the study of culture and cultural change which affect the peripheral regions of the world market. In the earlier studies of the development of culture based on England or other parts of western Europe (except for Ireland), the social struggle which led to the victory of capitalism and the rise of the middle class was carried on as an open struggle of social forces on the scene. This struggle was reflected in the approach to the history of the culture. One could speak of the "seeds of contradiction," or of "the working out of contradictions," or of the logic of the inevitable development of one social form to another, in culture as in society. Much of Russian and American writing concerning modernization supposes a path of development where phases one could choose follow each other. However, numerous studies now exist contradicting this trend (coming from different persuasions). This study is one of these. There still remains the problem of discussing change in a general way, specifically the

movement from one social formation to another. The hypothesis developed here is termed the regional division of labor in culture. The elite in Egypt in the early nineteenth century was reconstituted in response to the pressure of world market forces, through access to the reform culture of Istanbul. The travel of al-'Aṭṭār should not be seen as that of an isolated individual but as part of the mechanism of socialization and resocialization, involving travel and study abroad. The meaning which I attach to the travel of al-'Aṭṭār follows from the discovery of the fact that the later Islamic societies rooted themselves in a single modality of law and logic and did not (or could not) permit the adumbration of contradictory tendencies in their midst, as one would have found in a comparable study of England. As a hypothesis the idea that foreign travel serves as a mechanism of resocialization would seem to deserve further development, given the continuing relation between foreign education and elite transformation within a capitalist framework up to the present time.

The documentation presented is of two sorts: biographical and sociological. Al-'Aṭṭār is shown to be blocked from realizing intellectually and socially the type of development which could have been expected in the preceding decades. This appeared to solidify his resolve to study those subjects not available in his own environment. His travel abroad takes him to two very different centers of learning which appear to have had a long and complex relation through early modern history. In Istanbul, al-'Aṭṭār finds a structure of culture which has long been aware of trends in the West and which represented a pinnacle of the study of rational sciences. Al-'Aṭṭār imbibes this culture and returns home to be a leading reformer in the new Muḥammad 'Alī reform era.

On the sociological level, it is suggested that Cairo, Istanbul, and Damascus represented different sets of class relations in the eighteenth century and that from these relations arose different epistemologies in the ruling-class cultures. Istanbul was seen as progressing toward latifundia. The polarity between landlord/bureaucrat and peasant was seen as the foundation for the dominant Aristotelian character of thought: rationalist and systematic. Struggles over surplus between the regional and central authorities do not appear to affect this. Damascus, a traditional center of holistic mystical thought, was an industrial, commercial city. The dependence of the entire population on the fate of the long-distance trade and on predictable relations with Bedouins precludes the possibility that vertical cleavages could impose themselves as they did in Cairo and Istanbul. Among the discoveries of this study was that modern positivist science and medicine taught in Istanbul often shocked intellectuals accustomed to a holistic approach to knowledge. They would follow up an Istanbul period with a period of reintegrative study in Damascus. Thus, al-'Aṭṭār's effort to synthesize the findings of modern medicine into an Avicennian framework in 1814 was probably not uncommon, especially from what we know of the biographies of a number of Syrian and Turkish science students. This would perhaps be the case in Germany or Russia as well. It was al-'Aṭṭār's effort to confront the

problem of the circulation of the blood which brings him to read Ibn al-Nafis, alerting us to a discovery for the field of later Islamic medical history that Ibn al-Nafis' theory—a forerunner of or, conceivably, an influence indirectly on Harvey—was never entirely lost during the era of Avicennian dominance.

The return of al-ʿAṭṭār to Egypt (Chapter 6) makes clear that intellectual integration is no longer a necessary part of resocialization. The findings in this study are that it might in fact be an obstacle. The higher military officers and technocrats in alliance with foreign merchants carried out policies in Egypt in intellectual as well as physical isolation from the masses who were being manipulated. It was the lower bureaucrats, primarily Egyptians, who bore the brunt of reconciling their society to the changes taking place. This was an elite function but never one which could interfere with what was actually being done. Neoclassicism in language, literature, and history served the new ends but in science and medicine it did not, because it would reopen a path of mobility for socially discontented Egyptian Muslims by legitimizing their heritage. Thus the two major neoclassical works of al-ʿAṭṭār, the one in medicine and the other in elementary science, remain in the library of al-Azhar as forgotten manuscripts. A few copies of the scientific works of his close friend the Syrian Muḥammad al-ʿAṭṭār are to be found in Cairo, Damascus, and Istanbul, dating from a period of Turkish reform. However, further clarification is needed as to the role of Azhar culture within the context of the changed ruling-class orientation. This study poses the Azhar as pre-eminently the institution of the submerged middle class of the eighteenth century, in conflict with the new ruling class. This follows from a study of the lives of the different Shaykhs al-Azhar, apart from al-ʿAṭṭār. It is also based on the sympathy of the Azharites for the Wahhābī enemy of Muḥammad ʿAlī. It might possibly be demonstrated that, given the small size of the new elite, not merely the bureaucratic formation, but the Azhar as well, served as a buffer between itself and the masses, served therefore as a necessary part of the social and economic cycle. This point is raised since the development of a theory must account for the rapid even frenetic creation of, and abandonment of, institutions as a feature of ruling-class activity on the periphery (in Egypt from Muḥammad ʿAlī), while institutional reform is commoner in the industrial heartland.

In Chapter 7, we picked up the study of the development of law as theology as it evolved in the writings of al-ʿAṭṭār from the late eighteenth century. Al-ʿAṭṭār's first studies in logic in the 1790's point to his frustrations with the dominant culture of *ḥadīth* studies. First he passed through an Ashʿarite polemic phase, then more self-confidently he moved to Māturīdism, in which the role of reason is asserted as more determinative. His major work, completed in Egypt shortly before his accession to the position of Shaykh al-Azhar in 1831, was the most important systematic theology of the reform period. It was a two-volume gloss on a traditional text in *uṣūl al-dīn* (the roots of jurisprudence). It contained a discussion of the fruits of modern science and it employed in a number of areas a naturalist causality

Chapter 7 brings out the way in which continuity is maintained in the shift from *ḥadīth* and inductive logic to *fiqh* and deductive logic. Utilitarianism is shown in the later works of al-ʿAṭṭār to flow from the expansion of the role of argument of analogy, by which a flexible response to change could be achieved.

A feature of culture during the reform period was that it became dis-jointed from religion and law in certain ways. It was still neoclassical and it flowed from the general Aristotelian orientation. The models from the past were thus entirely different than they had been in the eighteenth century. This trajectory, superficially similar to that of the West, in fact owes its existence to the structure of society on the periphery. The conclusion of this chapter is that the models chosen in history, language, and literature were congruent with but not necessarily a product of research in theology, for example, Ibn Khaldūn. Some of the productions, such as a revival of *al-inshāʾ* (composition writing), clearly came from the new needs of the clerks of the bureaucracy.

Another clear effect of the vertical structure of bureaucratic life was the deterioration of poetry which became patently more insincere and high-flung. The free development of prose or musical composition seems to have been discouraged. Al-ʿAṭṭār, as is shown in another autobiographical fragment, never reconciled himself to all the changes. He hated bureaucratic relationships and missed the broader cultural environment which had existed in Egypt in his youth. The study of the well-known student al-Ṭaḥṭāwī in contrast to al-ʿAṭṭār in chapters 7, 8, and 9 completes the discussion of transition. The study of al-Ṭaḥṭāwī's major and minor writings led to the discovery that most of what is regarded as European influence came from his association with al-ʿAṭṭār. So he himself proclaims in his two major books, and this is substantiated by comparing the types of concerns, the choice of sources, the categories of thought of al-ʿAṭṭār and al-Ṭaḥṭāwī in the later 1820's and earlier 1830's. This necessarily revises sharply the view of al-Ṭaḥṭāwī as an innovator bringing back ideas from France. One need only know that he read Ibn Khaldūn with al-ʿAṭṭār, possibly even the work of al-ʿAṭṭār in which the latter used Ibn Khaldūn as a model to understand how he could find Montesquieu to be the Ibn Khaldūn of the West, to regard Lord Chesterfield's *Letters to his Son* as *maqāmāt*, to prefer republicanism to absolute monarchy. Al-Ṭaḥṭāwī's social background alone would explain why he would appreciate the virtues of the *dīwān* system of the eighteenth century, a form of republicanism, especially for merchants like his father, and the total disruption brought about by the bureaucracy of Muḥammad ʿAlī. His taste in science in Paris was quite Islamic; he liked observatories, which al-ʿAṭṭār had pointed out in his scientific writings were central to later Islamic science. But there are differences between the generations of al-ʿAṭṭār and his students which perhaps contribute to the discussion of our larger problem of transition. The students of al-ʿAṭṭār continued the neoclassicism, but having lacked a contact with the more broadly creative and less-regimented life of the eighteenth century, they greeted life in

the reform period with a certain optimism in the unfolding progress of humanity. Al-ʿAṭṭār did not. It would be interesting to pursue the thoughts of these students through the period in which the reform bureaucracy itself was destroyed and progress, in the sense they understood it, came to an end. Al-Ṭaṭṭāwī went to Russia, al-Ṭaḥṭāwī was in the Sudan, others were also scattered.

I began chapter nine by making an important distinction between creation and use of a given idea or technique, in order to suggest that Egypt, like much of the periphery of the world market, could not support a social structure that could create new technology, although the ruling class was aware of what existed and could selectively integrate those aspects which were politically possible, given class balances. This meant that the introduction of the printing press was much more difficult than European luxury products. The introduction of Western technology would and did involve a capacity to destroy the artisanate. Connected to the idea of use, and an awareness of relative utility, is the idea of the choice of the most advantageous source. Such calculations by the Mamlūks in the eighteenth century led them to abandon Muslim doctors and medical institutions in favor of those of Mediterranean minorities, with whom they had important economic relations as well. From a purely medical or scientific point of view, this was not rational on several counts. They were not acquiring anything new, particularly in medicine. The main medical developments were in England and Holland. Only later, when an Egyptian ruler, Muḥammad ʿAlī, had direct dealings with the industrial world of northwest Europe did one find that the technical advisors from these regions predominated.

The main contribution of chapter nine was to indicate the role of Islamic neoclassical thought in the rise of positivism in Egypt. The main conclusion reached was that in the sciences this route was bypassed in favor of a straight adoption of Western European books, despite the existence of impressive contributions from the neoclassical movement which could provide a congruent set of assumptions for modern scientific development and which, in some cases, like Ibn al-Nafīs, contained knowledge deemed correct by modern science. In Turkey indigenous writings continued to serve, but in Egypt the most important of these writings, the two surveyed in this chapter, remained in manuscript form. Hasan al-ʿAṭṭār's *Hāshiya ʿalā Sharḥ Qāḍī Zadeh* expressed the need of breaking down wholes into explainable parts, of testing propositions, and of relying on experiment over authority. In his *Sharḥ Nuzha*, the critique from within the Avicennian tradition, both of its accuracy on given points and of its soundness methodologically, is quite developed. These findings have a certain novelty, as scholastic writing is routinely dismissed by scholars as too narrow or rigid to convey modern thought. Hopefully, the fact that the Arabic route to positivism (at least in a number of fields) involved neoclassicism will stimulate a renewed interest in these writings, not just in the Arab lands but also in similar Mediterranean societies like Italy or Spain which have a huge heritage of scholastic literature as well.

Specifically, in chapter nine, I placed the decline of indigenous Egyptian participation in physical medicine and natural science in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries in a historical context. To do this I had to take sides in favor of an externalist type of explanation as opposed to an internalist one. In some fields, the application of political economy to technical knowledge is quite familiar. Unfortunately, this is not the case in the field of history of science and medicine, especially with regard to Arabic and Islamic studies. The balance here has always been on the side of the internalists, those who study development from within the problems generated by the discipline. First, the paradigm of Golden Age and decline, which has been adopted in the history of Islamic science and medicine and which has been clung to tenaciously, has nothing to say about the Islamic writings of the later centuries except that they are derivative of earlier ones. Second, the paradigm necessarily implies that the coming of the West was the principal watershed of modern times. Earlier, I had argued that, historically, Europeans were continuously in the Middle East and that their ideas were as varied as, and in fact identical with, those held by Middle Easterners. This should come as no surprise to readers of Michel Foucault or others who have traced the long slow rise of positivism to a position of dominance in French thought in the nineteenth century.

For the researcher of the future, the turn toward metaphysics and *al-ḥikma* in Egyptian eighteenth-century writings, which resulted from the writers' loss of patronage, should be seen as a challenging new subject. In chapter nine, this subject is cut short for the sake of developing fully the notion of neoclassicism. If, however, one pursued the writings of Aḥmad al-Sijā'ī or Aḥmad al-Damanhūrī and compared them to the scholars of Padua, a center of deductive medicine in Italy, or to the German medical schools of the nineteenth century which read Ibn Sīnā, a social analysis of the opposition to positivism could be produced.

Finally, the ninth chapter returns us to the claim made at the outset of this book, which is that underlying the writing of Middle Eastern history there have been long-term problems of proper conceptualization. As a hypothesis for why this should be the case, I offer the suggestion that the field is caught up with extraneous issues over which it has no control, for example, Western self-definition, as in propositions like the rise of the West or the coming of the West. Such ruling propositions show where the center of gravity of the discipline lies. *Islamic Roots of Capitalism*, as the title suggests, has as its central preoccupation the Western-centered structure of the discipline of history, notably the shackles this imposes on the development of the history of non-European peoples. From the perspective of Arab society this is a colonialist approach which only has room for Arabs as passive recipients of the West. Specialists in Middle East history have sometimes played into this by concentrating on various political elites in the Arab world who were weak at home and who very much relied on Western European support from their trading partners. These fit the stereotype. The decolonialization of history for Western scholars, including myself, is a slow

process. The very context which most of us take for granted, the strong state, is at issue. Our research based in the Arab or Ottoman state archives often serves to confirm our general picture of the world. As a result, women, who are half of any population, and groups who have avoided state dominance or whom the state administers indirectly, drop out of the picture. If one turns to the commercial sector, either Arab or that of the Mediterranean minorities functioning in Arab lands, one finds quite a different picture. The commercial sector was and is competing and struggling with Western Europe to wrest every possible gain out of the ongoing economic flow of world capitalism. If one looks at the large masses of peasants, tribes, and workers, again one finds it is their struggle which in large measure accounts for the rulers' weaknesses. The Arab world has made anything but a passive response to the pressures exerted by the world market through the local rulers. Of course Arab and Islamic lands did not produce systems on the periphery of the world market resembling in shape or in culture or in coercive technique what emerged in England. However, they did participate crucially in the development of the modern world through the international division of labor with its well-known unequal trade relations, before, during, and after the colonial period. Thus, logically, Islamic culture played a part in the main phases of modern world history. To allow, as is usually done, a watershed in world history like the industrial revolution of the eighteenth century to be constituted as a local event in English or French history is thus a regression to colonial history writing. A study of Egypt at the time of Shaykh Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār necessarily demonstrates these points.

Appendix I

The *Maqāmat al-ʿAṭṭār*

Various profligate wine-drinking people told me of how the French disturbed people on Tuesday and frightened many of them from the streets, gasping as they ran.

I went out of my house in confusion, not knowing what direction or what street to take; I was expecting my own destruction. But although I was afraid and unsettled, I did not restrain myself until as if by an unalterable fate I was drawn to al-Azbakiya, which is the residence of the wealthy. I was feeling a mixture of foreboding and yet desire, a feeling of venturesomeness. Thus, when I arrived, I fled back; then, steadying myself, I forced myself to think a second, which resulted in there coming to me a conclusion which gave me a feeling of peace and security—which was that the people of this area [al-Azbakiya] were a peaceful people and that many of them had been mingling without any fights occurring and with neither bad consequences nor awkwardness.

And I had heard from knowledgeable people who had traveled in different countries that these people were not cruel except to those who make war on them, and that some of them knew obscure fields of learning. They are informed about them and make experiments which appeal to them. Their hearts are filled with a love for philosophy, and they cherish what they acquire from its books. They esteem intellectual labor and reflection, and they seek out those who have knowledge of it and they would have the deepest conversations with them.¹

Beside the house in which he lived there were youths. These youths stood out like suns, vibrating and swaying like bridegrooms; their faces were veiled with beauty and they were tall and handsome like arrows. Their hair was like a banner which an army of lovers would follow, an army vibrating passionately with love. And I stared at them, gazing passionately, seeking that they come. Then I stopped staring at their beauty to praise their figures, and they became aware of what glances I was pouring on them, so that the group came right up to me and began to greet me. A youth from among them made me look at a book and we began talking; and I found his Arabic to be free from ungrammatical usages and from barren phraseology and other defects. After that, he began to tell me about some of the classical books of our famous writers, mentioning that he possessed various books and notebooks; then he began to enumerate and characterize them until he

mentioned the "Tadhkara" of al-Ṭūsī and the "Shifā'," which he called *Al-Shifā' al-sharīf*. And this astonishing fact confused me, made me dizzy—but what increased my astonishment even more was his love for literature. . . . He told me that he had translated from Arabic into his own language and that this piece [a piece of poetry which he recited to al-'Aṭṭār] he had decided to memorize. . . . A passion stirred in me which I had not felt for a long time. And a passion for literature which had once grown stronger, then weaker, was now revived. I sat up all night in dreamy meditation like one giddy with love, for no sleep came to me—so I decided to concentrate on writing some verses of poetry, and they are:

One of the French is a gazelle, the beauty of his eyelids has a strong
effect on the one who loves him
He appeared in dark clothes and I thought that they were alive
He is a garden of beauty, we must help him. . . .²

I met him in the afternoon of that day while he was with his youthful compatriots—all of them preoccupied with obscure areas of learning—some of them were versed even in intricate matters in the field of literature, to which they showed devotion. When I arrived at the session, they were beginning to let flow the wine, but observing the intensity of my disapproval, they let me look at books, large and small, books some of which I had never seen before, some of which [I knew to be] famous—and all either in the physical sciences or in literature. They put me at my liberty with their astronomical and engineering equipment, then they discussed with me various matters in these fields, writing down what I said. Then they sought from me a clarification of some of the verses of the *Burda*. After that they showed me some verses of poetry which were not compatible and asked me to explain to them their obvious meanings and their hidden meanings.

Someone told me that in their country they have a copy of the *Diwān of the Seven Mu'allaqāt*, and that they have some collections of poetry in their language that stir the spirit. And they continued to ask me to explain linguistic terms, comparing my answers to what was written in a precious book written along the lines of *Al-Jumhara*, containing Arabic expressions and their translation into French. After that I wrote for them some verses explaining the meaning of various words. Among these were two verses which I had composed previously, at a time when I was at my best:

Give me a chance, that I may describe to you how arrows fill my heart
Arrows which shed my blood—and bloodshed is forbidden
And then I will make any sin permissible!

To this I added two verses of a new poem which inspiration granted me, containing some words of their language. I gave it extemporaneously, and I do not want anyone to make an analysis of it.

Among the French there is a branch on which beauty has sprouted of various kinds— and he has a face like a new moon.

From inside the night of his clothes shines forth the pearls of his smile,
which flows out like forbidden wine.
His looks had the same effect on my heart as old wine
O heart! Have patience! For love once more shall rekindle your spirit
But to know him has become impossible,
For he has no pity on my passions. . . .

This poetry transported them with joy, astonishing them no end. They began to praise me for it, praising me to excess. Then they urged me to live with them, making me realize that this was a real request which they meant. But I kept putting off giving an answer and kept it a secret for lack of authorization, knowing that if I had gone ahead with this matter, rebukes and hostility would have awaited me as well as the scorn of society. Thus I returned to my senses and made my decision. May God forgive me for what I have done.³

Appendix II

Al-ʿAṭṭār's Itinerary

from 1802 to 1810

The interpretation presented in Chapter 6, relying on al-ʿAṭṭār's own writings, is quite at odds with the biography of Mubārak and al-Ḥusaynī. In this appendix, the questions of whether he visited Albania and whether he visited Syria more than once are discussed in greater detail.

Precise information about al-ʿAṭṭār's travels and associates is, as has been previously stated, difficult to find before the period in Damascus from 1810 to 1815. Concerning his departure from Egypt, al-ʿAṭṭār wrote: "I finished the rough draft of this gloss at the end of Dhū'l-Qa'da in the year 1217 [approximately March 20, 1802], at which time I was in the fort at Damietta on my way out of Egypt to Turkey; and this rough draft stayed with me until I returned from Turkey to Syria in 1225; when the French came, I left Egypt, taking this rough draft and some of my books. I stayed in the Ottoman [Rumīya] lands a long time; then I went to Damascus in Rabi' al-Awwal 1225 [April 14, 1810]."¹

If one supposes that the long stay in Damascus occupied the last five years which al-ʿAṭṭār spent abroad, there are still problems related to the first eight years, from 1802 to 1810. Al-ʿAṭṭār himself is not always clear. He stated: "I began my writing on this [book] when I was in Cairo, Egypt; then I traveled to Constantinople and wrote some of it, then I transferred to Alexandretta and wrote some more . . ."² If one understands this as an exact description of the sequence of events, we can locate a part of the time during which he was in Alexandretta from a reference in another of his writings, from the year 1807/1222. "Ḥasan al-Miṣrī thus ends his marginal comments, agreeing that the day of completion was on a Friday in Sha'bān of the year 1222 [October 1807], signing his name Ḥasan b. Muḥammad al-ʿAṭṭār al-Azharī ʿal-Shāfiʿī al-Miṣrī al-Khalwatī. I was in the city of Alexandretta when this was done on my trip out of Egypt."³ Elsewhere in the same work, we learn that, due to the inaccuracies in his work, it was actually completed not in Alexandretta itself but on the shores of the Black Sea at a place called Bayqūdh in a fortress called Yūdūdh. This would suggest that the date given may have been approximately a departure date. On the same page, he indicates that Alexandretta represented a busy period in his life, that he was teaching nearly every day in the mosque: a group of ten soldiers until they were taken off to battle, then some law clerks, and later a man who wanted to read a grammar book with al-ʿAṭṭār and chose ʿAbd al-Qāhir

al-Jurjānī's commentary called "*Dalā'il al-i'jāz innā li khaṣā'is*" on the work of 'Iṣām.

Thus, if we imagine that al-ʿAṭṭār left Alexandretta in 1807/1222 and that he had given a number of lessons over a period of time, we may postulate that he was in Alexandretta at least during 1806–1807/1221–1222.⁴ If he had given us a clearer idea of how much he accomplished in Alexandretta, the period might be considerably extended. He might have gone there as early as 1805. We know from al-Husaynī that he wrote a "part" of his book on geometry while there. In the field of argumentation (*ādāb al-baḥṭh*), he had been reading various commentaries in Turkey (i.e., in Istanbul), but found none that were to his satisfaction until he arrived in Alexandretta. However, al-ʿAṭṭār stated that "when I went to Damascus, I became occupied with reading that book with some brighter students; I found it to be a strenuous matter."⁵ The stay in Damascus which he refers to followed, but not necessarily directly followed, his stay in Alexandretta. From this one could understand either that he traveled to Damascus at a later date or that he visited Alexandretta a second time on his way out of Turkey. The first is the more likely. The only real problem here is what he meant by "I was in the city of Alexandretta [in 1807] on my way out of Egypt." This could be taken to support Mubārak's account, except that all the dated evidence from Syria is for the later period, and the Syrian sources virtually deny the existence of such a stay, as did al-ʿAṭṭār's own words in his work on *Al-Zharīya*.

The second major problem is whether or not al-ʿAṭṭār went to Scutari in Albania; or whether this "Scutari" was Ushkudar, a part of Istanbul known in English as Scutari and in Arabic as Ashkudrā. Al-Husaynī and Mubārak both based their information on al-ʿAṭṭār's son or on other relatives who claimed that he went to Albania, married there, had a son, and that both his wife and his son died. This would suggest a stay in Scutari of more than a year. Both sources also claim that he wrote at least two works while there, the "*Hāshiya ʿalā natā'ij al-afkār*" and the "*Tuḥfa*"⁶ An examination of the first work, however, proves that it was written in Alexandretta. Alexandretta is on the extreme southeast edge of Turkey, a point very distant from Albania. One might note that in yet another writing al-ʿAṭṭār was fairly specific about his travels. This was a diploma given to a Syrian student, in which he listed his travels as "Turkish, Syrian, and Hījāzī." In this, he did not mention Albania.⁷ Another piece of evidence adduced concerning his alleged travels to Albania was that one of his wife's relatives was said to have come from Albania to sit in his circle in the Azhar years later when he was a teacher there. According to this anecdote, which was told by one of his students, Ibrāhīm al-Saqqā', they spoke in Turkish, and when the man left, al-ʿAṭṭār had his mind on killing.⁸ It may well have been that he married an Albanian woman, and that one of her relatives came to Cairo. However, one might note that the Albanians generally spoke Illyrian rather than Turkish, and that, since there was a state of open warfare between the

Turks and 'Alī Bey of Yanina, contact between the two was on the whole probably limited. It certainly does not seem likely that al-'Aṭṭār went to Albania. But if he did, the strongest evidence to support such a claim has been overlooked. This is a comment on the writing of his "Tuḥfa" which appeared in his major work on theology, which was written between 1828 and 1830. Here he stated that while he was writing the "Tuḥfa," he was in "Rūmilī." One meaning of this term (if it was not a misprint) is the Ottoman administrative district of Rumelia (as opposed to Anatolia), that is, on the European side of the Bosphorus. Scutari of Istanbul is on the Asiatic side. However, since no one has seen the "Tuḥfa," there is no textual evidence of where it was written. Perhaps it was simply written in the European part of Istanbul where al-'Aṭṭār may have been staying. This view is supported by the claim which al-'Aṭṭār made in the same sentence, that when he finished it he took it immediately to the Şeyh ul-Islam, who wrote down his praise of it. The difficulty of coming from Scutari in Albania to Istanbul to see the Şeyh ul-Islam would almost seem to preclude this—quite apart from the special wartime circumstances.

'Alī Mubārak may have been misled about the travels of al-'Aṭṭār by a copy of Muḥammad al-'Aṭṭār's commentary on anatomy, the "Sharḥ 'alā manẓūmat al-'Aṭṭār." This source states that Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār composed his grammar text on the work of al-Birkāwī in the city of "Skandiriya al-Arnā'ud."⁹ Muḥammad al-'Aṭṭār is the earliest source for the "Albanian trip"; al-Ḥusaynī and Mubārak had read him. This particular copy was autographed by Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār, and he also wrote some comments on the text. Whether he had read the introduction (with the biography) cannot be ascertained. The printed text of the grammar book, however, as was stated above, denies this account, and cites Alexandretta as the place where it was written. The only conclusion which we can otherwise draw is that "al-Arnā'ud," generally understood to mean Albania, might have meant "Turkey" to the Syrian Muḥammad al-'Aṭṭār. Since "Skandariya," a version of the Arabic word for Alexandria and the Turkish word for Alexandretta, cannot be made to fit the geography of Albania, this is a possibility.¹⁰

While it would be difficult to prove that al-'Aṭṭār did not visit Albania, it can be proved from al-'Aṭṭār's writings that he was very familiar with the intellectual life in Scutari in Turkey during the early years of the nineteenth century. Scutari in Turkey, traditionally a terminus of the caravan routes from Persia (the Tabriz route) and Armenia, was also a Şūfī cultural center. There was an important Mevlevi *tekke* next to one of the several great cemeteries which contained the tombs of numerous saints.¹¹ In the eighteenth century, it had been for several decades an important center for the diffusion of Western science in the Ottoman empire. In 1734, a school of geometry had been founded in Scutari with a corps of mathematicians under Sulayman Bonneval, the son of Aḥmad Bonneval. The first professor of geometry at this school was Muhammad Sa'id Muftī Zadeh of Beyshehir (in Asia Minor) who was also the inventor of an instrument for artillerymen consisting of a quadrant and two arcs.¹² At the end of the eighteenth cen-

tury, at the time of Selim, there were advances in military engineering, and Scutari was an important center for these developments. In the 1790's, Selim, who was concentrating on his land army, set up fortifications at Levend-Tchiflik and Scutari in Turkey. These centers had cannoneers and bombardiers drilled by Europeans. The commanding officer for the latter was a Scotsman named Campbell, alias Inglis-Mustafa.¹³ The setting up of a printing press in Scutari was closely related to the needs of the army. Among the earliest works of the press were a number of texts and translations to be used by the Turkish officers.

However, as was the case with many of the early printing presses in the Middle East, the range of subjects included gradually widened, reflecting the cultural and religious orientations of the period. Such was the case with the press at Scutari. In 1802 and then again in 1804, it published the *Ṭarīqa muḥammadiya*, as well as al-Birkāwī's work on Arabic grammar, *Izhār al-asrār*. A second author whose works appeared was Nāṣir al-dīn al-Ṭūsī, author of *Kitāb Iqlīdīs fī'l-handasa*.¹⁴

Al-'Aṭṭār would seem to have had some degree of familiarity with this press and its publications, because in the same year in which the Scutari press was publishing these works, we find him studying and commenting on them. Al-'Aṭṭār wrote a grammatical essay commenting on al-Birkāwī's grammar text, which was identified above as having been finished in Alexandria in 1807. He wrote an essay attacking the *Ṭarīqa muḥammadiya*, which he called the "Tuḥfa." He also wrote a commentary on a work by al-Ṭūsī.

Both Hasan al-'Aṭṭār and Muḥammad al-'Aṭṭār wrote or commented on "Riyāḍiyyāt" and "al-Tabī'āt" while they were in Istanbul, as has been mentioned above. Indeed, it is borne out that both men worked on texts on solid geometry and wrote on classical texts of military engineering. While we possess no accurate list of the writing which was undertaken in these fields by either person, it was clearly substantial. As al-'Aṭṭār's interest in medicine formed a distinct part of his work during his stay in Istanbul, and as we understand that his writings in the natural sciences, together with his two works on al-Birkāwī, were done between 1802 and 1806 in Istanbul and Scutari, this material was being made available there at that time; the study of medicine came later.

The evidence is all circumstantial, but it is substantial. The existence of the press in Scutari and the interest in military engineering, on the one hand, and remoteness and relative backwardness of Scutari in Albania, on the other, make it seem much more reasonable that al-'Aṭṭār chose to stay in Scutari in Turkey.¹⁵ Of the books which al-'Aṭṭār was supposed to have written while in Albania, the one which was located was actually written elsewhere. Because of the existence of the press and its publications, it seems much more natural that it was written in Ushkudar than in Scutari, Albania. Finally, the other essay which is alleged to have been written in Albania, entitled "Risāla fī'l-farq bayn al-imkān wa'l-lā-imkān" (which has been lost), appears to be a study in *al hikma*, which he studied in Istanbul.

We conclude, therefore, that we have no persuasive evidence that al-ʿAṭṭār actually did go to Albania, nor even any logical reason for him to have traveled there, whereas all the activities which are recorded for him during his alleged stay in Albania appear to fit into the events of the time in the Istanbul-Scutari area in Turkey.

Appendix III

The Writings of

Hasan al-ʿAṭṭār

Sciences of the Sharīʿa

1. "Risāla fī'l-basmala wa'l-ḥamdala" (*tafsīr*). Manuscript. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo. 353 Tafsīr, Taymūr. 11 folios. Copy made in 1863/1280 in Damascus by an Algerian, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Balidī.
2. "Al-Taḳayyud wa'l-idāḥ li mā uṭliq wa ughliq min kitāb bi-Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ fī 'ulūm al-ḥadīth" (*muṣṭalah al-ḥadīth*). Manuscript. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo. Manuscript 25337. 107 folios. Edited by al-ʿAṭṭār, 1818/1234.
3. "Ḥāshiyat al-ʿAṭṭār 'alā matn al-nukhba fī uṣūl al-ḥadīth" (*muṣṭalah al-ḥadīth*). Unlocated.

Cited by ʿAbd al-Ghanī Ḥasan, *Hasan al-ʿAṭṭār*, pp. 84–85; al-Ḥusaynī, "Sharḥ al-umm al-musammā bi murshid al-anām li birr umm al-imām," p. 38. One basic text is the *Nukhba* of Ibn Ḥajar (Brockelmann, *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur*, GAL 2, p. 68; in No. 4, II, 189, al-ʿAṭṭār cited in a section on *ḥadīth* criticism "my Shaykh Shihāb"), possibly referring to Shihāb al-dīn Ibn Ḥajar. See Chap. 7, n. 14, indicating the influence of Ibn Ṣalāḥ.

4. *Ḥāshiyat al-ʿAṭṭār 'alā sharḥ Jalāl al-dīn al-Maḥallī 'alā jāmi' al-jawāmi' li 'Abd al-Wahhāb al-Subkī*. 2 vols. Cairo: Muṣṭafā al-Ḥalabī, n.d.

Original date of composition is 1828–1830 (Brockelmann, *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur* GAL 2, p. 89). This is the most important piece of systematic thought written during the reform period.

5. "Risāla fī ḥall lughz ba'd al-ʿulamā' min Latbalun" [*sic*]. Unlocated. Cited by al-Ḥusaynī, "Sharḥ al-umm al-musammā bi murshid al-anām li birr umm al-imām," p. 39.

Undoubtedly a work on *ʿilm al-kalām* written between 1802 and 1810. *Latbalun* could be a copying error for al-Tebelen, the South Albanian town of Tepelene. Al-ʿAṭṭār also stated that a group of Bulgarian *ʿulamā'* had come to him over a problem in *ʿilm al-kalām* concerning the attributes of God, a problem over which there was a conflict in their area. Al-ʿAṭṭār stated that he wrote an essay for them basing it on Fakhr al-dīn al-Rāzī, also citing the *Sharḥ al-Mu'allim* of Ibn al-Tilmansī, which attacked the Mu'tazilī position. See No. 4, II, 457.

6. "Tuḥfat gharīb al-waṭan fī taḥqīq naṣr al-Shaykh Ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī" (*kalām*). Unlocated.

Can also be dated from the stay in Turkey, since al-'Aṭṭār stated that he took it to the Ṣeyh ul-Islam Arab Zadeh, who wrote in praise of it. Al-'Aṭṭār identified this work as an attack on *Al-Ṭarīqa al-muḥammadīya* of Pir Birghili, and especially the commentary on it of Khadimi Zadeh. Al-'Aṭṭār stated that he defended the Ash'arī position. See No. 4, II, 523–524; al-Ḥusaynī, "Sharḥ al-umm al-musammā bi murshid al-anām li birr umm al-imām," p. 38.

7. "Risālat al-tadmīr 'alā Izmir" (*kalām?*). Unlocated.

Al-Ḥusaynī, "Sharḥ al-umm al-musammā bi murshid al-anām li birr umm al-imām," p. 38, stated that al-'Aṭṭār wrote this while in Izmir, Turkey (probably in 1806–1807). It is mentioned in conjunction with other essays on *kalām* which he was studying at this point.

8. "Hadhā jawāb Shaykh Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār 'an su'āl al-faqr Muṣṭafā al-Bidīrī." Manuscript. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo. 1171 Kālām. 18 folios.

This deals with the materialist views of creation in Islamic and pre-Islamic philosophy. Dated August 1813/Shabān 1228.

9. "Risālat al-'Aṭṭār fī 'ilm al-kalām." Manuscript. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo. B25816. 15 folios.

This is the same as "Risālat al-'Aṭṭār fī khalq al-af'āl fī 'ilm al-kalām," manuscript (al-Azhar, Cairo, 22985 Kālām [2344], folios 52–60). The difference is that the Dār al-Kutub copy has extended marginal comments by Shaykh 'Alī al-Milī, and some marginal comments by al-'Aṭṭār. This work was written, according to al-'Aṭṭār, to correct mistakes in the *Kubrā* of al-Sānūsī, in 1813/1228.

10. "Risāla tata'alliq bi mawḍū' 'ilm al-kalām." Manuscript. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo. Kālām, dated 1813/1228.

An essay on the utility of the rational sciences, based on the contention that one can approach every problem scientifically.

11. "Jawāb al-'Aṭṭār 'an su'āl jā' alayhi min Ustādh al-Shaykh al-Thu'aylib." Manuscript. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo. 1172 Kālām, dated 1814/1230. 30 folios.

See also al-Ḥusaynī, "Sharḥ al-umm al-musammā bi murshid al-anām li birr umm al-imām," p. 41, who states that this was one of two essays of importance on 'ilm al-kalām which became known only posthumously through copies made by al-'Aṭṭār's student Muḥammad al-Khuḍarī al-Dimyātī.

12. "Jawāb al-'Aṭṭār 'an su'āl jā' alayhi min Shaykh al-Faddālī." Unlocated.

Cited by al-Ḥusaynī, "Sharḥ al-umm al-musammā bi murshid al-anām li birr umm al-imām," p. 4, who states that this was the second of two essays referred to in No. 11, and that it dealt with the differences among the Ahl al-Sunna, al-Mu'tazila, and al-Ghaybiyīn. On the back of this essay, presumably the first copy, Shaykh al-Faddālī was said to have written in praise of al-'Aṭṭār's answers to these two

questions, saying that he gave answers which very few people could have given. The date and title are not known precisely.

13. "Risālat al-ʿAllāma Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār fī l-ijtihād." Manuscript. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo. 323 Majāmiʿ, Taymūr, folios 45–81. Copied in 1841/1264 by ʿAlī b. Futūḥ.

From internal evidence, the date of composition was probably around 1832, but on the first folio it is stated that it was written in 1844/1260, which was after al-ʿAṭṭār's death. The essay is an attack on the Ṣūfī Shaykh al-Sānūsī, who was a student or acquaintance of al-ʿAṭṭār when he came to al-Azhar around 1832.

14. "Ḥadhān masʿalatān min arbaʿin al-masāʿil allatī ṣannafahā al-Imām Fakhr al-dīn al-Rāzī fī ʿilm al-kalām." Manuscript. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo. 122 Kalām, Majāmiʿ, Taymūr, pp. 271–326.

This bears the signature *ex libris* Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār and underlinings in the text, apparently in the same ink.

Philosophy and *al-Ḥikma*

15. "Ḥāshiyat al-ʿAṭṭār ʿalā sharḥ Sharīf al-Ḥusaynī ʿalā hidāyat al-ḥikma li Athīr al-dīn al-Abharī." Unlocated.

Incomplete as of 1828. This is cited in No. 4, I, 31. See al-Ṣabbān's work on the same or a related text. Al-Jabartī, *Ajāʾib al-āthār fī l-tarājim waʿl-akhbār*, II, 237.

16. "Qalāʾid al-durr fī l-maqālāt al-ʿashar." Manuscript. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo. 340 al-Ḥikma wa al-falsafa.

This is the same as "Sharḥ al-ʿAṭṭār ʿalā al-Sijāʿī fī l-ḥikma" (or "... ʿalā manẓūmat al-Sijāʿī"). The work of Aḥmad al-Sijāʿī was "Naẓm al-ʿashar fī l-ḥikma." The date of al-ʿAṭṭār's work is 1804/1219. Brockelmann, *Geschichte der Arabischen Literatur*, S2, p. 256, cites another copy, Bayrūt 393, which has not been seen.

17. "Risāla fī l-farq bayn al-imkān waʿl-lā-imkān." Unlocated.

Al-Ḥusaynī, "Sharḥ al-umm al-musammā bi murshid al-anām li birr umm al-imām," p. 38, states that this was composed in Albania. The argument which has been presented in the text of this thesis is that al-ʿAṭṭār never went to Albania, which makes it more likely that he wrote this while in Turkey, i.e., before 1810.

18. *Ḥāshiyat al-ʿAṭṭār ʿalā maqālāt al-Sayyid al-Balidī*, written in 1818/1234 (al-Ḥikma). Cairo: al-Maṭbaʿa al-Khayriyya, 1911/1329.

The first of three works in which al-ʿAṭṭār moved to introduce elements of modern scientific thought into Egypt.

19. *Ḥāshiyat al-ʿAṭṭār (al-kubrā) ʿalā sharḥ al-Sijāʿī ʿalā al-maqālāt*, written in 1818/1234. Cairo: al-Maṭbaʿa al-Khayriyya, 1911/1329.

This is a full-length book written after his work on al-Balidī and intended as a completion of it.

20. *Ḥaṣhiyat al-‘Aṭṭār (al-ṣuḡhrā) ‘alā sharḥ al-Sijā’i alā al-maqālāt*. Cairo: al-Maṭba‘a al-Khayriyya, 1911/1329.
Composed in 1826/1242 and based on the writings of his teacher Muḥammad al-Disūqī.
21. “Tafsīr maqālāt Aristū li Ibn al-Farrāj ‘Abdullah b. al-Jīb.” Manuscript. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo. M-1 Falsafa. Not located.
Al-‘Aṭṭār made corrections (“Taṣḥīḥ al-‘Aṭṭār”) in 1827/1243.

Natural Science and Technology

22. “Sharḥ al-‘Aṭṭār ‘alā risālat tashrīḥ al-aflāk fī ‘ilm al-hay’a.” Unlocated.
The commentary or gloss is on the text of Bahā’ al-dīn al-‘Āmilī (dated after 1818/1234). See No. 18, pp. 178, 221.
23. “Ḥaṣhiyat al-‘Aṭṭār ‘alā Ḥaṣhiyat Ibn al-Fath (Muḥammad b. al-Ḥādī b. Naṣr b. Sa’īd al-Husnī al-‘Irāqī, al-musammā bi Taj al-Sa’īdī, ‘alā sharḥ ta’sīs al-ashkāl li Mūsā b. Muḥammad al-ma’rūf bi Qādī Zadeh al-Rūmī ‘alā ashkāl al-ta’sīs li Shams al-dīn al-Samarqandī),” completed 1821/1237. Manuscript. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo. 219 Khidiwī, Riyāḍiyyāt, Majāmi’, folios 41–100. The copyist was ‘Abd al-Khāliq Sulaymān al-Burḥīmī.
This is a major work of Egyptian neoclassicism in science.
24. “Kitāb idāḥ al-Murādī bi sharḥ hidāyat al-rāmī li Muḥiy al-dīn b. Taqī al-dīn al-Sulṭān al-Dimashqī.” Closing few pages written by Ḥasan al-‘Aṭṭār. Unlocated. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo. Funūn al-ḥarbīya.
25. “Risāla fī kifāyat al-‘amal bi’l aṣṭurlāb wa’l-muqanṭar wa’l-mujīb wa’l-basā’iṭ” (*al-mīqāt*). Unlocated.
Cited in Mubārak, *Khiṭaṭ*, IV, 30–31, but not in earlier sources.
This leads to the deduction that it was written after 1815.
26. “Ḥaṣhiyat Faṣīḥ al-dīn li Muḥammad al-Nizāmī ‘alā sharḥ Qādī Zadeh al-Rūmī,” written in 1473/878, dedicated to al-Amīr ‘Alī Shāh al-Wazīr. Manuscript. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo. 58 Riyāḍiyyāt. Unlocated.
This has the writing of Ḥasan al-‘Aṭṭār on it.
27. Theodosius, *Kitāb al-Ukar*.
An Arabic translation of the *Spherica* begun by Quṣṭā’ b. Lūqā and completed by another hand. This manuscript is an eighteenth-century copy with an autograph ex libris Ḥasan al-‘Aṭṭār. Listed in Leon Nemoy, “Arabic Manuscripts in the Yale University Library,” *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences* 60 (1956): 158, item 1495.
28. “Risāla fī’l-raml wa’l-zā’irjā.” Unlocated.
Al-‘Aṭṭār might have approached this subject either from *kalām* or from science. It is cited only by Mubārak, *Khiṭaṭ*, IV, 40, and hence was probably written after 1815.

Logic and *Adab al-Baḥth*

29. "Ḥāshiyat al-ʿAṭṭār 'alā sharḥ Muḥibbullah al-Bihārī 'alā sullam al-Akhḍarī," written in 1819/1235. Manuscript. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo. 4 Maṭniq, Ādāb al-Baḥth, Ḥalīm. 111 folios. Copy dated 1820/1236. Marginal comments on folio 111 are by Naṣr al-Ḥurīnī and are dated 1269.

The manuscript does not identify the commentary by name, which creates some ambiguity. The information is provided in No. 31. Likewise, a copy of *Sharḥ sullam al-ʿulūm* by al-Bihārī (Dār al-Kutub, Cairo. 88 Maṭniq, Khidwī, printed in 1861/1278). Al-Bihārī also wrote "Ḥāshiya 'alā sharḥ Mullā Ḥasan 'alā sullam al-ʿulūm" (Al-Azhar, Cairo. Manuscript 48727, 1230 al-Imbābī). In the text cited he refers only to al-Mallāwī, leaving it unclear which text the gloss was written on.

30. *Ḥāshiyat al-ʿAṭṭār 'alā sharḥ Shaykh al-Islām Zakariyā al-Anṣārī 'alā matn Isāghūjī li'l-Abharī*, written 1820/1236. Cairo: al-Maṭba'a al-ʿilmiya, 1908/1327.
31. "Ḥāshiya [or Sharḥ] al-ʿAllāma 'Abd al-Ghaffār 'alā al-fawā'id al-ḍiyā'iya." Unlocated.

Cited in No. 29, p. 24, in which al-ʿAṭṭār stated that he discussed "*al-dalāla wa'l-lafẓ*" and that he had obtained some good insights in his marginal comments. Written before 1820/1236.

32. *Ḥāshiyat al-ʿAṭṭār 'alā sharḥ 'Ubaydullah al-Khabīṣī 'alā tadḥhib al-maṭniq al-shāfi' li'l-Taftazānī*, dated 1824/1240. Cairo: al-Maṭba'a al-Azharīya, 1927/1346.
33. "Ḥāshiyat 'Abd al-Ḥakīm al-Siyalkūti 'alā Ḥāshiyat 'Alī b. Muḥammad al-ma'rūf bi'l-Sayyid al-Sharīf al-Jurjānī 'alā sharḥ Quṭb al-dīn Muḥammad al-Rāzī, al-musammā bi lawāmi' al-asrār fī sharḥ maṭāli' al-anwār." Manuscript. Al-Azhar, Cairo. 48736 al-Maṭniq, 1239 al-Imbābī.

On the selection on logic of "*Kitāb Maṭāli' al-Anwār*," by Qaḍī Sirāj al-dīn b. Aḥmad, known as al-Urmāwī (died 1283/682). Al-ʿAṭṭār wrote extensive comments on the margins, mainly in the first 60 folios of the total of 198. He signed his name and dated it 1828/1242. (The text reads 1142, but this is clearly an error.)

34. "Taqrīrāt al-ʿAṭṭār 'alā ḥāshiyat 'Abd al-Ḥakīm al-Siyalkūti 'alā sharḥ Quṭb al-Rāzī 'alā al-māshīya." Manuscript. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo. 556 al-Maṭniq, Ādāb al-Baḥth, 6 folios. Undated, but probably written after 1815.
35. "Risālat ḥal al-Māhiya maj'ūla ām lā." Unlocated.

This is an essay on logic dealing in part with *qiyās*. It is cited in No. 28, folio 69B, which was completed in 1819/1235.

36. "Ḥāshiyat al-ʿAṭṭār 'alā sharḥ 'alā al-risāla al-walādiyya li Muḥammad al-Mar'ashī," 1795. Manuscript. Al-Azhar, Cairo. 36484 (147), folios 29-80.

37. "Ḥāshiyat al-'Aṭṭār 'alā sharḥ al-Bahnasī 'alā al-risāla al-walādiyya li Muḥammad al-Mar'ashī," 1811. Manuscript. Al-Azhar, Cairo. 14484, 400 Majāmi', folios 71B-98A.
38. "Ḥāshiyat al-'Aṭṭār 'alā sharḥ Mullā Ḥanafī 'alā adāb al-baḥṭh li 'Aḍud," 1826/1242. Manuscript. Al-Azhar, Cairo. 36484 (147), pp. 1-28.
- The "Sharḥ" is by Muḥammad al-Tibrizī, known as Mullā Ḥanafī (died 1494), in "Al-Risāla al-'Aḍudiyya fi adāb al-baḥṭh wa'l-munāẓara," written by 'Aḍud al-dīn al-Ījī (died 1355).

Language Sciences

39. "Manẓūma fi 'ilm al-naḥw" (grammar), dated 1787/1202. Manuscript. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo. 449 Grammar, majāmi', folios 114-117.
- French edition is entitled *Petit traité de grammaire arabe en vers*, translated by J. Sicard. Algiers: Imprimerie Orientale Pierre Fontana et Cie., 1898.
40. "Ḥāshiyat al-'Aṭṭār 'alā sharḥ Khālīd al-Azhari 'alā al-ajurrūmiyya li Abū 'Abdullah b. Ajurrūm," 1792/1207 [?]. Manuscript. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo. H4876. 9 folios. Copied by 'Abd al-Majīd al-Jizrī in 1792/1207.
41. "Risāla tata'alliq bi khatm sharḥ al-Azhari 'alā al-ajurrūmiyya." Unlocated.
- Al-Ḥusaynī, "Sharḥ al-umm al-musammā bi murshid al-anām li birr umm al-imām," p. 59, dates this between 1810 and 1815.
42. "Ḥāshiyat al-'Aṭṭār 'alā sharḥ Khālīd al-Azhari al-musammā bi mawāṣil al-ṭullāb ilā qawā'id al-i'rāb li Ibn Hishām," 1794/1209. Manuscript. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo. H6416. 228 pages.
- This is one of several grammar works from the eighteenth century which were used into the twentieth century.
43. *Ḥāshiyat al-'Aṭṭār 'alā sharḥ Khālīd al-Azhari 'alā matnihi al-muqaddima al-azhariyya fi 'ilm al-'arabiyya* (grammar), 1802/1217. Cairo: al-Maṭba'a al-Adabiyya, 1901/1319.
44. "Ḥāshiyat al-'Aṭṭār 'alā sharḥ Muṣṭafā b. Ḥamza al-Aṭrūlī [sic] al-musamma bi nata'ij al-afkār fi sharḥ iẓhār 'alā iẓhār al-asrār li Muḥammad Pīr al-Birghīlī," 1805. Manuscript. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo. 212 Qawala, Grammar.
- Note that the name of the commentator is variously spelled; see Brockelmann, *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur*, GAL 2, p. 441, who wrote "Aṭalizade" but "Ataly" in *ibid.*, S2, p. 656.
45. "Ḥāshiyat al-'Aṭṭār 'alā lamīyat al-af'al li Ibn Mālīk." Manuscript. Al-Azhar, Cairo. 8756 (119). Copied in 1820/1236 by Muṣṭafā Suwaylīm. A second copy of the manuscript is Dār al-Kutub, Cairo, 9 Sarf, the latter has been misplaced.

Presumably the author of the commentary was also Ibn Mālīk,

but this has not been confirmed. This copy is 78 pages long.

46. Aḥmad b. ʿAlī b. Masʿūd. [*Hadhihi*] *majmūʿa fī ʿilm al-taṣrīf mushta-mil sitta kutub*. Cairo: Būlāq Press, 1825.

Introduction by Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār.

47. "Al-Farq bayn al-jāmʿ wa ism al-jins al-jamāʿī wa l-fardī" (n.d.). Manuscript. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo. 1294 Grammar. One folio. Co-authored with Shaykh Muṣṭafā al-Badri al-Dimyāṭī, probably after 1815.

48. "Qaṣīda fī l-naḥw min baḥr al-taʿwīl." Unlocated.

Al-Ḥusaynī, "Sharḥ al-umm al-musammā bi murshid al-anām li birr umm al-imām," p. 39, states that this gives examples of *ghazal* poetry and that it begins, "Bi ḥamdak yā mawlāya ibdāʾ fī amrī."

49. "Manzūma fī l-farq bayn ʿāmʿ al-muttaṣila wa l-munqaṭiʿa." Unlocated.

Cited by al-Ḥusaynī, "Sharḥ al-umm al-musammā bi murshid al-anām li birr umm al-imām," p. 39.

50. "Hidāyat al-anām li ʿāmʿ atā min al-aḥkām." Manuscript. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo. 601 Grammar. Unlocated.

Cited by Brockelmann, *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur*, 2, p. 720. Copied by ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ al-Sayyid Muḥammad al-Dimyāṭī.

51. "Ḥāshiyat al-mughnī fī l-naḥw." Unlocated.

Presumably a gloss on the text of Ibn Hishām called "Mughnī al-labīb ʿan kutub al-aʿarīb." The commentator is not known, but was perhaps Jalāl al-dīn al-Suyūṭī. See al-Bayṭār, *Hilyat al-bāshir*, I, 492.

52. "Ḥāshiyat al-ʿAṭṭār ʿalā al-samarqandīya fī ʿilm al-bayān [or fī l-istiʿāra]," 1797/1212. Manuscript. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo. H5255.

The basic text is called "Farāʾid al-fawāʾid [or al-ʿawāʾid] li taḥqīq maʿanī al-istiʿāra" and was written by Abū l-Qāsim al-Layṭhī al-Samarqandī (died 1483). The name of the commentator is not given.

53. *Ḥāshiyat al-ʿAṭṭār ʿalā al-samarqandīya fī ʿilm al-bayān*. Cairo: al-Wahhābiya Press, n.d.

An enlargement of the same work as No. 52. Written in 1815.

54. "Ḥāshiyat al-ʿAṭṭār ʿalā sharḥ ʿIṣām al-dīn al-Isfarāʾīnī b. ʿArabshāh ʿalā risāla waḍʿīya al-ʿaḍudīya li ʿAḍud al-dīn al-Ījī." Manuscript. Al-Azhar, Cairo. 131 ʿIlm al-waḍʿ, al-Imbābī, folios 123–194. Copy dated 1861/1278.

Probably written before 1815. Al-ʿAṭṭār referred to it (in folio 123A) as "*taqayyudāt*." This precedes No. 57, which was his last work on this text.

55. "Ḥāshiyat al-Khiṭāʾī (Nizām al-dīn ʿUthmān) ʿalā sharḥ al-mukhtaṣar li Saʿd al-dīn al-Taftazānī ʿalā talkhīṣ al-miftāḥ li Jalāl al-dīn al-Qazwīnī." Manuscript. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo. 13M al-Balāgha.

The catalog cites that there are marginal comments on this copy by al-ʿAṭṭār; this was not easy to determine.

56. "Ḥāshiyat ʿalā taʿrīb al-risāla al-fārsīya fī l-bayān li ʿIṣām al-dīn al-

Isfarā'inī al-musammā bi risālat 'Iṣām al-dīn." Unlocated.

Cited by Muḥammad al-'Aṭṭār, "Sharḥ 'alā manẓūmat al-'Aṭṭār," folio 2B.

57. "Ḥāshiyat al-'Aṭṭār 'alā sharḥ 'Iṣām 'alā al-risāla al-'aḍudiya." Manuscript. Aḥmadī Mosque, Tanṭā. 8 [558]. 16 folios. Dated 1814-1815.
On folio 16 al-'Aṭṭār states that he was "approaching Egypt" when he wrote this.

History and Geography

58. "Risāla fī taḥqīq al-khilāfa al-islāmīya wa manāqib al-khilāfa al-'Uthmāniya." Manuscript. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo. 380 Maktaba Zakīya, n.d. 36 folios.

This is a major work of neoclassical scholarship. It marks the earliest Egyptian attempt to employ the model of Ibn Khaldūn.

59. Taqī al-dīn al-Maqrīzī. *Al-Bayān wa'l-arāb 'an mā bi arḍ Miṣr min al-'arāb*. Cairo: 'Alām al-Kutub, 1961.

There are comments by Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār on the margins, which are drawn from the manuscript Dār al-Kutub, Cairo, 1150 Tārīkh, preserved by the editor, 'Abd al-Majīd 'Ābidin. See especially pp. 9-10, 73.

60. Abū'l-Fidā'. "Kitāb taqwīm al-buldān." Manuscript. Maktaba Baladiya, Sūhāj. 13 al-Jughrafiya.

With marginal comments by al-'Aṭṭār which are dated 1833. This manuscript came from the library of al-Ṭaḥṭāwī, who studied it with al-'Aṭṭār. See al-Ṭaḥṭāwī, *Manādhij*, p. 375.

61. Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Raḥman al-Sakhāwī. "Al-Ḍaw' al-lāmi' li ahl al-qarn al-tāsi'." Manuscript. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo. 675 Tārīkh.

Inscription by al-Zabīdī, 'Abd al-Raḥman al-Jabartī, and Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār, who stated that he had read this book.

62. Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm, known as Ibn al-Ḥanbalī. "Durr al-ḥabb fī tārīkh a'yān Ḥalab." 2 vols. Manuscript. Maktaba Baladiya, Sūhāj. 60 al-Tārīkh.

Extensive marginal comments by al-'Aṭṭār in II, folio 10.

63. Ṣalāḥ al-dīn al-ma'rūf bi-Ibn Shākīr al-Kutubī al-Ḥalabī. "'Uyūn al-tawārīkh." Manuscript. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo.

Bears the signature of al-'Aṭṭār.

Medicine

64. "Manẓūmat al-'Aṭṭār fī 'ilm al-tashrīḥ." Manuscript. Al-Azhar, Cairo. 508 Abāza. 49 folios. Dated 1808/1223. Unlocated.

Marginal comments by al-'Aṭṭār are dated 1813/1228.

65. "Sharḥ al-Qānūnjā li'l-Jaghminī." Unlocated.

Cited by al-Husaynī, "Sharḥ al-umm al-musammā bi murshid al-anām li birr umm al-imām," p. 38, as work which al-ʿAṭṭār began but did not complete in Damascus.

66. "Sharḥ al-ʿAṭṭār al-musammā bi rāḥat al-abdān ʿalā nuzhat al-adhḥān fī ʿilm al-ṭibb," 1813/1228. Manuscript. Al-Azhar, Cairo. 3434 Riwāq al-Maghāribā. 251 folios.

A prodigious work of neoclassicism in medicine, including a major critique of Ibn Sīnā's findings in anatomy.

67. "Nubdhā fī ʿilm al-jirāḥa li taʿrif akl al-fūl bi'l-qaṭ' wa'l-khaṭṭ." Unlocated.

Cited in Mubārak, *Khiṭaṭ*, IV, 39, and supposedly written in Damascus.

68. "Maqāla li taʿrif al-baṭṭ." Unlocated.

Cited in Mubārak, *Khiṭaṭ*, IV, 39. On lancing of ulcers.

69. "Maqāla li taʿrif al-faṣḍ." Unlocated.

Cited in Mubārak, *Khiṭaṭ*, IV, 39. On bloodletting.

70. "Maqāla li taʿrif ḥāl al-kayy." Unlocated.

Cited in Mubārak, *Khiṭaṭ*, IV, 39. On cauterization.

71. "Juz' ʿalā sharḥ al-mubarrad." Unlocated.

Cited in Mubārak, *Khiṭaṭ*, IV, 39. Al-ʿAṭṭār stated that in this book he discussed the difficulty of pulse taking with a *qaṭṭ*. This problem was also discussed in No. 64, which was written in Damascus.

72. "Ḥawāshī al-ʿAṭṭār ʿalā sharḥ al-manẓūma al-ṭibbiya li Baḥrāq al-Ḥaḍramī." Unlocated.

Cited in No. 30, pp. 102, 106, 172. Dating from 1820/1236 or earlier. On a question in anatomy. Probably the commentator was Jamāl al-dīn Muḥammad b. ʿUmar Baḥrāq al-Yamanī al-Ḥaḍramī, died 1524/930, known for his "Sharḥ al-kifāya fī'l-ṭibb" (Brockelmann, *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur*, S2, p. 554). The only work located entitled "Kifāya fī'l-ṭibb" was by Masīḥ b. Ḥakīm al-Dimashqī (Brockelmann, *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur*, S2, p. 1029).

73. Amīn al-dawla b. al-Faraj B. Yaʿqub b. Ishāq al-maʿruf bi-Ibn al-Qifī. "Al-Uṣūl fī sharḥ al-fuṣūl li kitāb al-fuṣūl li Buqrāṭ." Manuscript. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo. 4 Ṭibb, a copy dating from 1712/1124.

Marginalia and signature of Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār on the last folio. In No. 64, he noted having used Ibn al-Qifī as a source.

74. Sulaymān al-maʿrūf bi-Ibn Juljul. *Ṭabaqāt al-aṭibbā' wa'l-ḥukamā'*. Unlocated.

Al-ʿAṭṭār is said by al-Taḥṭāwī to have written marginal notes in a copy of this work. See al-Taḥṭāwī, *Manāḥij*, p. 376.

Literature

- 75 Shihāb al-dīn al-Khafajī. *Rayḥānat al-alibba' wa nuzhat hayāh al-dunyā* [also called *Ravḥānat al adab*]. Leningrad: University of

Leningrad Manuscript 733. With al-'Aṭṭār's signature.

Cited in Kratchkowski, *Ḥayāt Muḥammad 'Iyād al-Ṭanṭāwī*, p. 145. The text was published in Cairo by Būlāq in 1856 and was edited by one of al-'Aṭṭār's associates, Ibrāhīm al-Disūqī. See al-Shūrbajī, *Qa'ima bi awā'il al-maṭbū'at al-'arabiya al-mahfūza bi Dār al-Kutub*, p. 170.

76. "Maqāma fī dhukūl al-Faransāwiyīn li'l-diyār al-Miṣrīya." Manuscript. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo. 7574 al-Adab.

Approximate date of composition, 1800–1801/1216–1217. A short autobiographical work, an important forerunner of modern literary realism.

77. *Hadhā nakhb diwān al-fātin al-adīb . . . Ibrāhīm b. Sahl al-Isrā'īlī al-Andalusī al-Ishbīlī*. Cairo: Maṭba'at 'Abd al-Ghanī Fikrī, 1862/1279. Manuscript version is Dār al-Kutub, Cairo. 222 al-Adab.

Introduction and conclusion and selection of poems by Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār. Dated 1229/1814. Al-'Aṭṭār's editing of this *diwān* marks a reaction against poetic formalism.

78. "Diwān al-'Aṭṭār." Unlocated.

Said to have been lost in Damascus in or before 1815 (al-Ḥusaynī, "Sharḥ al-umm al-musammā bi murshid al-anām li birr umm al-imām," p. 39). Al-'Aṭṭār is quoted as saying that he lost it in Damascus with some baggage, that it was 80 folios in length. See *Rawḍat al-madāris al-miṣrīya* 1, no. 18 (1869/1287): 36–37. The loss of this work makes it very difficult to study al-'Aṭṭār as a literary figure. Many old books cite one or two lines of his. He himself quotes his poetry in small pieces in virtually every work he wrote. The largest collection, No. 81, unfortunately represents the conventional poetry that he wrote for the court.

79. "Risāla jumī'a fihā ba'd muqatta'āt shi'rīya fī funūn mukhtalifa." Unlocated.

Cited by al-Ḥusaynī, "Sharḥ al-umm al-musammā bi murshid al-anām li birr umm al-imām," p. 39.

80. *Isma' il al-Khashshāb. Diwān al-Khashshāb*. Edited by Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār. Istanbul: Maṭba'at al-Jawā'ib, 1882/1300.

Compiled around 1815 on the death of his friend al-Khashshāb.

81. *Al-Inshā'*. Cairo: Maḥmūd Tawfiq, 1936.

An early edition is Cairo: Būlāq Press, 1835/1250. The date of the first edition or of the original composition is not known (Salāma, *Enseignement islamique en l'Egypte*, p. 199). Another old copy which was located is Dār al-Kutub, Cairo, 25 al-Adab. This was published by Būlāq in 1859. It was edited by a *shaykh* known himself to have written in prosody, Shaykh Muḥammad al-'Udwi.

Miscellany

82. "Mukhāṭaba wa mujāwaba bayn al-adīb al-Shaykh Muṣṭafā Bakrī al-Saʿatī . . . wa Shaykh Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār," *Rawḍat al-madāris al-miṣriyya* I, no. 18 (1869/1287): 25–32; no. 19, pp. 24–28; see also nos. 18 and 19 passim.
83. *Ijāza* to Abū Ḥāmid al-ʿArabī b. Muḥammad al-Dumnātī al-Fasī (died 1837/1253).
Summarized in al-Kattānī, *Fihris al-fahāris*, II, 469, in which it is stated that the original could be found in a manuscript, which was not located, entitled "Fahrasat Ibn Ḥāmid al-Dumnātī."
84. *Ijāza* in medicine to ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Khulāṣī (died 1839/1255).
Cited in al-Maʿlūf, *Al-Usra al-ʿarabiyya al-mushthara*, p. 19. It was located in the deceased author's family library in Baʿlabakk, where it remained until at least 1973, when it was allegedly sold.
85. *Ijāza* to Arif Hikmet Bey.
Cited *in extenso* by Shihāb al-dīn al-Alūsī, "Al-Ṣadiḥ bi shahīq al-nujūm ʿalā afnān tarjamat Shaykh al-Islām wa walī al-niʿam" (al-Azhar, Cairo, manuscript, 7221 Tārīkh, Abāza). This work is an important source on the life of Arif by a well-known ʿIrāqī reformer.
86. Letters to ʿAbd al-Raḥman al-Jabartī, 1798–1800, in al-Jabartī, *Mazhar al-taqdis fī dhahāb dawlat al-Faransīs*, pp. 14, 382, and passim.
Idem, *ʿAjāʾib*, III, 163–64.
87. Praise of the Madaniyya Ṣūfī order (a branch of the Shādhiliyya), in Muḥammad Zāfir al-Madani, *Al-Nūr al-sāṭiʿ waʾl-burhān al-qāṭiʿ* (Cairo, 1883/1301), p. 43.
88. Address to the Abū Zaʿbal medical school graduating class of 1834, in Clot Bey, *Mémoires de Clot Bey*, edited by Gaston Wiet (Cairo: Imprimerie de l'Institut Français d'Archaeologie Orientale, 1949), pp. 130–131.
89. *Ijāza* to Ḥasan al-Bayṭār (ca. 1815).
See ʿAbd al-Razzāq al-Bayṭār, *Ḥilyat al-bāshir fī tārikh al-qarn al-thālith ʿashar*, II, 489–492.
90. Minor poetry in al-Jabartī, *ʿAjāʾib*, III, 44, 97, 114, 307; IV, 28, 232–233, 239, 240; Mubārak, *Khiṭaṭ*, IV, 38–40; No. 4, I, 8, 214, 249, 316, 326, 446; II, 195, 247, 255, 332, 448, 453, 466, 506, 510, 513, 514, 527, 552; No. 31, pp. 19, 25, 62; No. 33, p. 215; Taha Husayn and others (eds.), *Muqataʿāt min kutub al-adab al-ʿarabi* (Cairo, n.d.) I, 246, II, 246; al-Ṭaḥṭāwī, *Takhlīs*, p. 53.
91. Unlocated correspondence: letter to Muṣṭafā al-Bakrī in *Rawḍat al-madāris al-miṣriyya*. Cited by ʿAbd al-Ghani Ḥasan, *Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār*, pp. 58–59.
92. Bureaucratic communications: These are extensive. Bureaucratic communications exist for the last ten years of al-ʿAṭṭār's lifetime and are located in the National Archives (Dār al-Wathāʾiq al-Qawmiyya)

of Egypt, which I was not able to secure permission to use. Some of these communications are summarized in *Al-Waqā'i' al-Miṣriya* and in Sāmī, *Taqwīm al-Nīl*. A study of the bureaucratic structure based on these archives could greatly increase our understanding of the ruling class of Egypt during this period, and would also add much to what is known of individual persons.

93. Introduction: *Taqriṣ al-'Aṭṭār 'an Takhliṣ al-ibriz li'l-Ṭahṭāwī*. Cairo: Bulaq, 1850. Title page.

Notes

1. *The Social and Economic History of Egypt, 1760–1815*

1. The coffee trade and its impact on Egypt are not studied here. The reader may wish to consult André Raymond (*Artisans et commerçants au Caire au XVIII^e siècle*, I, 157–175).
2. Douglas C. North and Robert Paul Thomas, *The Rise of the Western World*, and Na'im Zakī Fahmī, *Ṭuruq al-tijāra al-duwāliya wa maḥaṭṭātuha bayn al-sharq wa'l-gharb*.
3. E. J. Hobsbawm, "The Crisis of the Seventeenth Century," in *Crisis in Europe*, ed. Trevor Ashton, pp. 55–56.
4. Ibid.
5. Henry Dodwell, *The Founder of Modern Egypt*, pp. 3–6.
6. James Capper, *Observations on the Passage to India through Egypt*, p. xvii.
7. Alfred C. Wood, *A History of the Levant Company*, p. 165 and passim.
8. Barrington Moore, Jr., *The Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*, pp. 45, 108–110, and passim.
9. This movement contrasts sharply with the enclosures movement in England, which was contemporaneous with it. Moore suggests (ibid., p. 48) that this may have been related to the fact that French viniculture did not require enclosures.
10. Ibid., pp. 45, 53–55.
11. Ibid., p. 75.
12. Ibid., pp. 75, 80, 89, 103.
13. R. R. Palmer, *Twelve Who Ruled*, pp. 235–236. Also note the comment on the shortage of gunpowder during this period. This is also commented upon by French travelers to Egypt, and Napoleon commented on it (see Georges Rudé, *The Crowd in the French Revolution*, chap. 11).
14. P. Masson, *La Histoire du commerce Français dans le Levant au XVIII^e siècle*, p. 479; French food insufficiency and high cost of imports discussed in *L'Ankylose de l'économie Méditerranéenne au XVIII^e siècle et au début du XIX^e siècle: Le rôle de l'agriculture*, ed. L. Bergeron, Ruggiero Romano, *Commerce et prix du blé à Marseilles au XVIII^e siècle*, pp. 20–21.
15. John W. Livingston, "'Alī Bey al-Kabīr and the Jews," *Middle East Studies* 7 (May 1971): 221–229. Customs receipts increased for the government when the Syrians took over (see Raymond, *Artisans et commerçants au Caire*, I, 11, 486).
16. Masson, *La Histoire du commerce Français*, pp. 595–596; Raymond, *Artisans et commerçants au Caire*, I, 174.
17. Masson, *La Histoire du commerce Français*, p. 602.
18. The source is Jean Baptiste Trecourt (*Memoires sur l'Egypte 1791*, ed. Gaston Wiet). The author was a French consul in Egypt.
19. Ibid., p. 25.
20. Ibid., pp. 26 n. 6, 92. For a more comprehensive discussion of the diet of the lower

- classes, see Edward W. Lane, *The Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, p. 198, where he states that the lower classes ate mainly bread made of millet or maize, plus milk and cheese, but that rice and meat were too expensive for them (pp. 581, 589). Lane adds that the cost of wheat was four times that of rice. He also adds that this apparently poor diet is belied by the apparently healthy physique of the lower classes. Unlike Lane, Trécourt (*Mémoires sur l'Égypte 1791*) seems to have had little firsthand knowledge of the lower classes.
21. Trécourt, *Mémoires sur l'Égypte 1791*, p. 27. The writer cannot of course make clear the relationship between fluctuating prices and monopolies. He was perhaps aware of profiteering in grain by the *beys*, a practice quite common in France as well.
 22. *Ibid.*, pp. 51–55. Trécourt, like other writers, contrasted it to the trade in rice which, while clandestine, was very considerable (p. 89). Like other writers, he also commented on the weakness of the Egyptian defenses (p. 29). Trécourt referred to yet another product on which the French became increasingly dependent after 1789. This was natron salt, which was used in a number of soap factories in Marseilles and in making gunpowder (p. 25). Raymond (*Artisans et commerçants au Caire*, I, 186) stated that Damietta was the only source of rice for the Ottomans as well and that they continued to take the great bulk of what was produced.
 23. Palmer, *Twelve Who Ruled*, p. 227.
 24. G. A. Olivier, *Voyage dans l'empire Othman*, II, 166. Writing in 1795, he stressed French dependence categorically.
 25. François Charles-Roux, *Les Origines de l'expédition de l'Égypte*, p. 262. This writer is typical in his portrayal of the rapacious activities of the *beys* in the 1790's, ignoring what must have been for them a major economic problem following the decision of the Convention and the British contraband decree.
 26. *Ibid.*, pp. 275, 323–325.
 27. Raymond, *Artisans et commerçants au Caire*, I, 814–815.
 28. Ashin Das Gupta, "Trade and Politics in the Eighteenth Century in India," in *Islam and the Trade of Asia*, ed. D. S. Richards, pp. 190–191; see also Helen Rivlin, *The Agricultural Policy of Muhammad 'Alī in Egypt*.
 29. John W. Livingston, "The Rise of Shaykh al-balad 'Alī Bey al-Kabīr: A Study of the Accuracy of the Chronicle of al-Jabartī," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 33 (1970): 283–294; Stanford Shaw, *Ottoman Egypt in the Age of the French Revolution*, pp. 241–278.
 30. Lusignan, *A History of the Revolt of Ali Bey against the Ottoman Porte*, pp. 20–31. See also Chapter 3 under "History."
 31. Shaw, *Ottoman Egypt*, p. 144.
 32. *Ibid.*, pp. 77–81. Shaw presents one account of the Suez customs according to which it had been controlled by the Mamlūks since 1713, and another according to which the governor controlled it throughout the eighteenth century.
 33. Stanford Shaw, *The Financial and Administrative Organization of and Development of Ottoman Egypt, 1517–1798*, pp. 297–300.
 34. *Ibid.*, pp. 316–337.
 35. Shaw, *Ottoman Egypt*, p. 144.
 36. Masson, *La Histoire du commerce Français*, p. 33.
 37. Shaw, *Ottoman Egypt*, pp. 110–111. The illegal *awqāf* had the effect of handing

down possession of land within families without going through the bureaucratic procedures upon the death of the owner, and undoubtedly constituted, especially in the Delta, the first step toward the development of private property in land.

38. Ibid., p. 83.
39. Shaw, *Financial and Administrative Organization*, p. 194; see also his *Ottoman Egypt*, pp. 73, 91–92. Raymond, *Artisans et commerçants au Caire*, II, 729, gives evidence of some Janissary assimilation into Egyptian society.
40. Shaw, *Ottoman Egypt*, p. 94.
41. Ibid., pp. 95 nn. 92–102, 137 n. 2.
42. Ibid., pp. 137–138 n. 3.
43. Raymond, *Artisans et commerçants au Caire*, I, 103, discusses fighting between the *beys* for control of grain in Upper Egypt in 1788.
44. P. M. Holt, "Al-Jabarti's Introduction to the History of Ottoman Egypt," *Bulletin of the School for Oriental and African Studies* 25 (1962): 38–52.
45. David Ayalon, "Studies in al-Jabarti, I: Notes on the Transformation of Mamlūk Society in Egypt under the Ottomans," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 3 (1960): 148–174, 275–325, esp. pp. 157–160.
46. Ibid., p. 290, suggests two factors: intermarriage within a Mamlūk household and reliance on mercenaries to do the fighting. Perhaps the use of mercenaries did save Mamlūk lives, but in the long run the decline of the household as a warrior unit, which was its basic *raison d'être*, combined with the new economic incentives to trade on an individual basis undermined the Mamlūk system.
47. The latter point is argued in Derek Hopwood, *The Russian Presence in Syria and Palestine, 1843–1914*, pp. 11–12.
48. Masson, *La Histoire du commerce Français*, p. 580. But despite these claims, the French had much closer relations. In 1786, when the Ottomans invaded Egypt and temporarily expelled Murād and Ibrāhīm, several French merchants who were owed large sums of money went bankrupt. The Russians were never this deeply involved.
49. L. P. Choiseul-Gouffier, *La France en l'Orient sous Louis XVI*, p. 121; Masson, *La Histoire du commerce Français*, p. 311.
50. Masson, *La Histoire du commerce Français*, p. 570. For Russian influence among the *beys* a little earlier, see Lusignan, *A History of the Revolt of Ali Bey*.
51. Ayalon, "Studies in al-Jabarti, I," p. 278; on Africans, see p. 315.
52. Gabriel Guémard, *Adventuriers Mamluk de l'Egypte*, pp. 1–43. This will be discussed in the section on the Napoleonic period.
53. E. R. J. Owen, *Cotton and the Egyptian Economy, 1820–1914*, p. 15. A main obstacle to tax collection was that the government actually received only about 20 percent of the taxes raised.
54. A. G. Politis, *L'Hellénisme et l'Egypte moderne*, I, 92–94.
55. Jean Savant, *Les Mamelouks de Napoleon*, p. 31.
56. Guemard, *Adventuriers Mamluk de l'Egypte*, p. 22 and *passim*.
57. Citizen Andreossy, "Extract of a Report . . . Relative to the Manufacture of the Saltpetre and Gunpowder of the Country," in *Memoirs Relative to Egypt*, pp. 39, 42–43; "n.b. We have entered into a few of the details relative to the fabrication of gunpowder, the object of which was entirely foreign to the programme, merely for the purpose of painting the barbarous physiognomy of the

- arts, among a people who have attained the last stage of degeneracy" (p. 44).
58. Gabriel Guémard, *Une Oeuvre française: Les réformes en l'Égypte d'Ali-Bey El-Kebir à Mehemet 'Ali 1760-1848*, pp. 63-64.
 59. Ayalon, "Studies in al-Jabarti, I" p. 302.
 60. Palmer, *Twelve Who Ruled*, p. 237. The French weaponry which Egypt imported was made at St. Etienne.
 61. André Raymond, "Essai de géographie des quartiers de résidence aristocratique au Caire au XVIII^{ème} siècle," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 6 (1963): 58-103, esp. p. 79.
 62. G. Douin, "Le Carosse de Mohamed Bey," *Bulletin de l'Institut de l'Égypte* 8 (1926): 168-169. It would seem that his honorific name came not from this specific occasion but from his general love of luxurious tents and harnesses.
 63. G. Guémard, "De l'Armement et de l'équipement des Mamelouks," *Bulletin de l'Institut de l'Égypte* 8 (1926): 8, 10, 12.
 64. V. J. Parry, "Djariid," *Encyclopedia of Islam*, 2d ed., I, 532. How they paid for their new expenses deserves a separate study which has never even been attempted. Clearly, many Mamlūks invested in trade, as one can tell from the names on the *wikālas* listed by 'Alī Mubārak in *Al-Khiṭaṭ al-tawfiqiyya al-jadida*, II, 25; or from a *waqfiyya* studied by Afaf Lutfi al-Sayyid Marsot ("A Socio-Economic Sketch of the 'Ulamā' of the Eighteenth Century," in *Colloque Internationale sur l'Histoire du Caire*, pp. 313-321), discussing M. Effendi al-Bakri (died 1779), who the author discovers is drawing military wages and at the same time is employed in the coffee trade.
 65. Raymond, *Artisans et commerçants au Caire*, II, 401. Raymond gives the information that after 1776 more than one-third of the rich merchants were foreigners, elsewhere stating that they had monopolies in important export items, such as senna [pp. 622-623]. Raymond also indicates a growing difference for such families as Dou or Borelly-Reboul in the rate of profit on investment in Egypt as compared to rates of profit in Europe. In these ways Egypt anticipates by a century a number of the key aspects of the model of Samir Amin (*Accumulation on a World Scale*, I, 102-103; II, 379) as characteristic of "mature" underdevelopment. On intermarriage see Raymond, *Artisans et commerçants au Caire*, II, 414-415, 684.
 66. Raymond, *Artisans et commerçants au Caire*, II, 412, 414-415, 578-582.
 67. *Ibid.*, I, 194; II, 461-462.
 68. *Ibid.*, I, 291-300.
 69. *Ibid.*, II, 406-407; I, 212, 232, 236. On capitalist as opposed to "feudalist" mentality of a merchant with regard to farm labor, see II, 722. There were objective forces propelling those who could afford to invest in land to do so as urban rent on shops was declining after 1789, and the Hilw made changes in proprietors complicated (see I, 268-270).
 70. *Ibid.*, I, 175, 299-300.
 71. Terence Walz, "The Trade between Egypt and Bilād As-Sūdān" (doctoral dissertation), shows the rising price of household slaves in the late eighteenth century.
 72. Raymond, *Artisans et commerçants au Caire*, II, 406-412.
 73. 'Abd al-Rahmān 'A. 'Abd al-Rahīm, "Dirāsa nusṣiyya li'l-kitāb hazz al-quhūf fī sharh qasīdat Abī Shādūf," *Al-Majalla al-Misriyya li'l-Dirāsāt al-Tārīkhīya* 20 (1973): 287-316. Stanford Shaw, "Landholding and Land Tax Revenues in Ottoman Egypt," in *Political and Social Change in Modern Egypt*, ed. P. M. Holt, pp. 91-103.

74. 'Abd al-Raḥman 'A. 'abd al-Raḥīm (*Al-Rīf al-Miṣrī fī'l-qarn al-thāmin 'ashar*) deals with rural industry and commerce, which served as outlets for urban capital.
75. Raymond, *Artisans et commerçants au Caire*, II, 421-423, 426-427.
76. Marsot, "A Socio-Economic Sketch of the 'Ulamā'," pp. 313-321; Shaw, *Ottoman Egypt*, p. 98. Raymond (*Artisans et commerçants au Caire*, II, 421-423) stresses that the direct ties of the 'ulamā' were in most cases to the lower merchants.
77. Marsot, "A Socio-Economic Sketch of the 'Ulamā,'" pp. 4-8. The *shaykhs* of many Ṣūfī orders had close connections to guilds, especially among the poor (Raymond, *Artisans et commerçants au Caire*, II, 437, 439, 441).
78. André Raymond, "Tunisiens et Maghrebins au Caire au dix-huitième siècle," *Les Cahiers de Tunisie* 7 (1959): 336-371, see esp. p. 360. In his study of the Maghribī community, Professor Raymond found a close connection between the commercial and religious professions.
79. George Baldwin, *Memorial Relating to the Trade in Slaves*, p. 2. Baldwin evaluated the Sudanese trade at about the same value, while the Meccan trade he put at 3 million pounds and the Syrian trade at 50,000 pounds. The trade to Mecca, however, is not easily separable from the ventures of several communities, so that this figure is a little confusing.
80. Raymond, "Tunisiens et Maghrebins au Caire," pp. 353-354.
81. John Burckhardt, *Arabic Proverbs, or the Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, p. 183. This book was compiled in 1817, at which time the author found that the elite of the Maghribī community was intact and that the expression "the word of a Maghāriba (*kilma maghribiya*)" was used as an expression for commercial honesty, a trait for which they were known.
82. Raymond, *Artisans et commerçants au Caire*, II, 383, 386.
83. *Ibid.*, I, 283ff, 238-239.
84. *Ibid.*, II, 379; I, 215.
85. André Raymond, "Problèmes urbains et urbanisme au Caire aux XVIIIème et XVIIIème siècles," in *Colloque Internationale sur l'Histoire du Caire*, pp. 353-373. This excluded the port of Bulāq, which was always maintained.
86. *Ibid.*, p. 13.
87. Raymond, *Artisans et commerçants au Caire*, II, 512, 566, 558. The best evidence for the breakdown of the guild is the breakdown of the *futuwwa*, or corporate identity, the last document of *futuwwa* being found was dated 1733 (*ibid.*, II, 529-543). The role of Coptic artisan in Muslim guilds could have been only a minor factor (*ibid.*, II, 459, 526).
88. *Ibid.*, II, 546, 565-566.
89. André Raymond, "Quartiers et mouvements populaires au Caire au XVIII siècle," in *Political and Social Change in Modern Egypt*, ed. P. M. Holt, pp. 104-116, esp. pp. 110-111.
90. *Ibid.*, pp. 107-108; André Raymond, "Deux leaders populaires au Caire à la fin du XVIIIe et au début du XIX siècle," *La Nouvelle Revue du Caire* 1 (1975): 281-298. For the appeal of the Bayyūmīs to lower-class elements, highwaymen in particular among its adherents, and also water carriers, see W. A. S. Khālidi, "Bayyūmiya," *Encyclopedia of Islam*, 2d ed, I, 1151-1152. The middle class disapproved of their wild and ecstatic *dhikr*.
91. Raymond, "Quartiers et mouvements populaires au Caire," p. 115.
92. Raymond, "Problèmes urbains et urbanisme au Caire," p. 19.

93. Maxime Rodinson, *Islam et capitalisme*, pp. 68–69. There were 2,000 textile workers in al-Maḥalla al-Kubrā, 600 in Banī Swaif, and 250 in Qīna (Owen, *Cotton and the Egyptian Economy*, pp. 12–13).
94. Citizen Girard, "Remarks on the Management and the Produce of the Land in the Province of Damietta," in *Memoirs Relative to Egypt*, I, 393–417; Olivier, *Voyage dans l'empire Othman*, II, 167; Amin, *Accumulation on a World Scale*, I, 149–150.
95. Shaw, *Ottoman Egypt*, pp. 142–143.
96. Khalīl Shaybūb, 'Abd al-Raḥman al-Jabartī, pp. 10–11.
97. 'Abd al-Razzāq al-Bayṭār, *Ḥilyat al-bashir fī tārikh al-qarn al-thālith 'ashar*, see esp. I, 534.
98. Masson, *La Histoire du commerce Français*, p. 597.
99. Politis, *L'Hellénisme et l'Égypte moderne*, I, 99; Masson, *La Histoire du commerce Français*, p. 604.
100. Masson, *La Histoire du commerce Français*, pp. 467, 597. The presence of a Syrian Christian customs official in Damietta doubtless helped the French.
101. J. Heyworth-Dunne, *Introduction to the History of Education in Modern Egypt*, pp. 22, 249; Afaf Lutfi al-Sayyid Marsot, "The Political and Economic Functions of the 'Ulamā' in the 18th Century," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 16 (1973): 154.
102. Heyworth-Dunne, *History of Education in Modern Egypt*, pp. 88, 333.
103. Rivlin, *Agricultural Policy of Muḥammad 'Alī*, pp. 7–9.
104. Politis, *L'Hellénisme et l'Égypte moderne*, I, 127.
105. *Copies of Original Letters from the Army of General Bonaparte in Egypt*, p. 7.
106. Ibid., p. 100; Politis, *L'Hellénisme et l'Égypte moderne*, I, 127.
107. Politis, *L'Hellénisme et l'Égypte moderne*, I, 142.
108. Guémard, *Une Oeuvre française*, pp. 69–72.
109. Savant, *Les Mamelouks de Napoleon*, pp. 41, 52–54.
110. Matti Moosa, "Napoleon's Islamic Policy in Egypt," *Islamic Quarterly* 9 (1965): 103–116, esp. p. 111 n. 2.
111. Terence Walz, "Notes on the Organization of the African Trade in Cairo, 1800–1850," *Annales Islamologiques* 11 (1972): 266, 269–270. The author stresses that the Dārḥūr caravan brought a wide range of African products, including feathers and ivory, and not merely slaves. Shaw (*Ottoman Egypt*, p. 156) states that there was a decline in the profitability of the slave trade during the occupation, but it must have been in more than only slaves. This would seem to be a way in which the occupation, in trying to side with the middle class, actually disrupted it.
112. Shaw, *Ottoman Egypt*, p. 156.
113. M. Abir, "The 'Arab Rebellion' of Amīr Ghālib of Mecca, 1788–1813," *Middle East Studies* 5 (1972): 191–194. Amīr Ghālib, it turned out, was willing to accept French subsidies in return for the loss of trade, and even sent Napoleon supplies so that he could turn his main attention to the Wahhābī threat.
114. Some of the Mamlūks did return, after their wives paid out large sums in ransom called "safeguard." The French raised some 490,000 pounds in this way, but there is no indication that returning Mamlūks could get their claims to the land validated. See Ibrāhīm El-Mouelhy, "L'Enregistrement de la propriété en Égypte durant l'occupation française," *Bulletin de l'Institut de l'Égypte* 30 (1949): 199.

115. *Ibid.*, p. 208.
116. Rivlin, *Agricultural Policy of Muhammad 'Alī*, pp. 40–41.
117. Owen, *Cotton and the Egyptian Economy*, p. 14. This failure must have been all the more bitter to the French because, even in the short time during which the savants worked in Egypt, they discovered a number of new commercial possibilities which enhanced the attractiveness of the idea of staying. Berthollet and Descotils proved that henna, which was a profitable export item for Egypt, would be profitable as well for the coloration of wool. An improvement in the refining of local sugar would make sugar export very profitable. See Olivier, *Voyage dans l'empire Othman*, II, 171–173.
118. Guémard, *Aventuriers Mamluk de l'Égypte*, p. 37. See also Omar Toussoun, "La Fin des Mamelouks," *Bulletin de l'Institut de l'Égypte* 15 (1933): 187–205, esp. p. 189, where travelers' reports are quoted on the number of Mamluks seen in Egypt during this period who were of German, Catalan, Sicilian, and Italian origin, who had converted to Islam and served various houses. Toussoun also mentioned that with the withdrawal of the English army in 1807 a number of English prisoners also became Mamluks.
119. Rivlin, *Agricultural Policy of Muhammad 'Alī*, chap. 2.
120. Owen, *Cotton and the Egyptian Economy*, pp. 17–19. Particularly active in the development of Muhammad 'Alī's trading policy were the Greeks. The Greeks created Muhammad 'Alī's merchant marine (1809–1811) as they had Murād Bey's before him. Some of these Greeks had known Muhammad 'Alī from his youth in Cavalla, for example, the former tobacco merchants, the Tossizza brothers, who later served him in Egypt in diverse capacities. Among others who served Muhammad 'Alī were Athanasios Lasulli and Jean Anastasios. Muhammad 'Alī protected the Greek community during the Greek War of Independence, when the Ottomans ordered him to exterminate the Greeks in Greece. In fact, he permitted the Greek independence movement to function in Cairo and Alexandria. See Politis, *L'Hellénisme et l'Égypte moderne*, I, 168.
121. John Burckhardt, *Notes on Bedouins and Wahabys*, pp. 344–345.
122. Ernest Misset to the Foreign Office, Cairo (January 12, 1814), British Foreign Office (FO 24/5). The same source had earlier detected the possibility of an alliance between the Wahhabis and the Mamluks; Misset to the Foreign Office (March 25, 1812), British Foreign Office (FO 24/4); John Burckhardt, *Travels in Arabia*, p. 261.
123. Lane, *Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, p. 340.
124. Owen, *Cotton and the Egyptian Economy*, p. 20. A contemporary source commented that, of the eight hundred deserters of the French army who had converted to Islam, he could count in 1818 no more than eighty. The rest had been cut down by wars and the plague. They complained of being in arrears in their pay. Their leader, 'Abdullah of Toulouse, had recently died, and the second man, Salīm of Avignon, was dying (Count de Forbin, *Travels in Egypt, Being a Continuation of Travels in the Holy Land*, p. 15). One suspects that their more clever compatriots had by this time left the ranks of the Mamluks to enter trade or service in the bureaucracy of the new army. Those who attempted to regain control of their land after the abolition of the *iltizām* system generally lost out.
125. Anwar Abdel-Malek, *Ideologie et renaissance nationale de l'Égypte moderne*,

- pp. 232–234; Şaliḥ Mursī, "Thawrat al-ʿumyān," *Al-Hilāl* 78 (1970): 76–84.
126. ʿAbd al-Raḥman al-Jabartī, *ʿAjaʿib al-āthār fī l-tarājim wa l-akhbār*, IV, 161. Reference courtesy of Professor Afaf Marsot.
127. Rivlin, *Agricultural Policy of Muḥammad ʿAlī*, pp. 54, 56.

2. The Religious Framework of the Eighteenth-Century Revival

1. A seminal work on the role of structures such as these at the dawn of modern capitalism is James L. Peacock, "Mystics and Merchants in Fourteenth-Century Germany: A Speculative Reconstruction of Their Psychological Bond and Its Implications for Social Change," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religions* 8 (1969): 47–59.
2. S. Moreh, "The Sociological Role of the Ṣūfī Shaykh in Eighteenth-Century Egypt" (doctoral dissertation), pp. 398–399.
3. Ernst Bannert, "La Khalwatiyya en Egypte," *Mélanges Institut Dominicains Etudes Orientales* 8 (1964–1966): 10.
4. The Wafāʾiyya also had a branch in Aleppo, although to what extent it recognized the authority of Muḥammad Abī Anwār in Egypt is not known (see al-Bayṭār, *Ḥilyat al-bāshir fī tarīkh al-qarn al-thālith ʿashar*, III, 1553–1555).
5. On the different branches of the Khalwatiyya, see B. G. Martin, "A Short History of the Khalwatiyya Order of the Derviches," in *Scholars, Saints and Sufis*, ed. Nikki R. Keddie, pp. 275–307.
6. The main source is Tawfīq al-Bakrī, *Bayt al-Sādāt*. An article based on this source is N. C.-D., "L'Aristocratie religieuse en Egypte," *Révue du Monde Musulmane* 2 (1908): 241–283.
7. Muḥammad Sayyid al-Kilānī, *Al-Adab al-Miṣrī fī zill al-ḥukm al-ʿuthmānī*, pp. 144–145.
8. Al-Bayṭār, *Ḥilyat al-bāshir fī tarīkh al-qarn al-thālith ʿashar*, I, 97–98.
9. Al-Bakrī, *Bayt al-Sādāt*, p. 16; al-Kilānī, *Al-Adab al-miṣrī fī zill al-ḥukm al-ʿuthmānī*, p. 145.
10. Shaw, *The Financial and Administrative Organization*, p. 139; C.-D., "L'Aristocratie religieuse en Egypte," p. 263. The same source lists numerous other properties which he either inherited or acquired in some other way, which included agricultural lands, urban real estate, and a palace at Azbakīya (p. 269). Additional information was supplied by a distant relative of Muḥammad Abī Anwār, a lawyer named Ḥamīd ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd al-Hakāʾī, who possesses copies of court records from the Maḥkāma al-Sharʿī'a confirming the information in this article.
11. Al-Kilānī, *Al-Adab al-miṣrī fī zill al-ḥukm al-ʿuthmānī*, pp. 135–172 and *passim*. Al-Bakrī (*Bayt al-Sādāt*, p. 3) cites a poem by the Sultan Selim mentioning the connection of the Wafāʾī family with Ahl al-Bayt.
12. Al-ʿĀmilī was known in several fields (see Carl Brockelmann, *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur*, II, 357; S1, p. 114; S2, p. 595). Fuat Sezgin (*Geschichte des Arabischen Schrifttums*, I, 527, 546) states that he wrote a commentary in three parts on Imāmī Shīʿī *fiqh* as well as essays in science and literature. He also wrote on the theme of Ahl al-Bayt.
13. Another work on Ahl al-Bayt by a Ṣūfī contemporary stated that the author had heard warnings that it is necessary for the Muslims to seek the blessings of the Ahl al-Bayt, citing the fact that the Prophet visited Zaynab's tomb when she

- died (Aḥmad al-Sijā'i, "Al-Ruwwād al-naḍīra fī mā yata'alliq bi'l-bayt al-bashīr al-nadhīr").
14. The chief collection was made by a disciple, al-Ḥasan al-Badrī al-'Awaḍ, in "Al-Lawā'ih al-anwāriya."
 15. Al-Kilānī, *Al-Adab al-miṣrī fī zill al-ḥukm al-'uthmānī*, pp. 159–160. Ibn al-Hānī was an important literary source of al-'Aṭṭār (see Chapter 4). Al-Sādāt was likewise referred to by various writers, according to al-Kilānī, with expressions of highest praise, "*ruh al-dahr*" and "*qurrat 'ayn al-dīn*."
 16. Al-Kilānī, *Al-Adab al-miṣrī fī zill al-ḥukm al-'uthmānī*, pp. 163, 169.
 17. Ignace Goldziher, *Muhammadan Studies*, ed. S. M. Stern, II, 290, esp. pp. 255–344 n. 2.
 18. An early example exists by a famous Shaykh al-Azhar in his work on the *ṣaḥāba* dated 1741/1154 (see Chapter 4 on tomb visiting in Egypt, miracles, and spirits rising from the tomb, 'Abdullah al-Shubrāwī, *al-Ithāf bi ḥubb al-ashraf*).
 19. C.-D., "L'Aristocratie religieuse en Egypte," especially pp. 263, 268; al-Jabartī ('*Ajā'ib al-āthār fī'l-tarājim wa'l-akhbār*, II, 227) gives his death as 1206 and not 1205. The book by al-Ṣabbān referred to in the text is not identified.
 20. Al-Jabartī, '*Ajā'ib al-āthār fī'l-tarājim wa'l-akhbār*, II, 227; 'Alī Mubārak, *Al-Khiṭaṭ al-Tawfiqiyya al-jadīda*, VIII, 109–110; 'Abd al-Hā'ī al-Kattānī, *Fihris al-fahāris wa āthbāt wa mu'jima al-ma'ājim wa'l-mashikhāt wa'l-musalsalāt*, II, 109–110; Brockelmann, *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur*, GAL 11, p. 288.
 21. Muḥammad al-Ṣabbān, *Kitāb is'af al-rāghibīn fī sirat al-muṣṭafa wa faḍā'il ahl al-bayt*. On the margin of this book is published another work entitled *Nūr al-abṣār fī manāqib al-bayt al-nabī al-mukhtār* by Sayyid al-Shiblānī. This last work is an especially good source on al-Zabīdī.
 22. Al-Ṣabbān, *Kitāb is'af al-rāghibīn fī sirat al-muṣṭafa wa faḍā'il ahl al-bayt*, p. 1.
 23. Shaybūb, '*Abd al-Raḥman al-Jabartī*, pp. 34–42. Al-Jabartī had a kunya (it was Abū'l-'Azim) from the Wafā'iyya, as did his brother. Another student of al-Ṣabbān, Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār, was known as Abū'l-Sa'ādāt. The most appropriate name was reserved for al-Zabīdī, Al-Sayyid Abū'l-Anwār b. Wafā' bi-Ibn al-Fayyid (see al-Kilānī, *Al-Adab al-miṣrī fī zill al-ḥukm al-'uthmānī*, p. 287).
 24. Al-Kilānī, *Al-Adab al-miṣrī fī zill al-ḥukm al-'uthmānī*, pp. 153, 169–170.
 25. *Ibid.*, pp. 97, 129, 131. The smaller Khalwatiyya-Dimirdāshīya branch was not part of the Bakriyya reform movement.
 26. Hans Joachim Kissling, "Aus der Geschichte der Chalvetiyye-Ordens," *Zeitschrift der Deutsches Morgenländer Gesellschaft* 103 (1953): Table 2, p. 282; Ban-nerth ("La Khalwatiyya en Egypte") claimed that the Sammāniya derived from al-Hifnāwī and not al-Bakrī, and that they were located in the eastern Sudan. He likewise found a long list of those who became Khalwatīs (cf. al-Jabartī, '*Ajā'ib al-āthār fī'l-tarājim wa'l-akhbār*, I, 298–299) under al-Hifnāwī. Kissling ("Aus der Geschichte der Chalvetiyye-Ordens") states that al-Hifnāwī had only two main disciples, Aḥmad al-Dardīr and Maḥmūd al-Kurḍī, and that the others were followers of these.
 27. Al-Jabartī, '*Ajā'ib al-āthār fī'l-tarājim wa'l-akhbār*, I, 291. Courtesy of Professor A. Marsot.
 28. The view that the line of al-Kurḍī led only to the Ṭijāniyya is contradicted by al-Bayṭār, *Hilyat al-bāshir fī tārikh al-qarn al-thālith 'ashar*, III, 1415, where the example is given of Muḥammad al-Saqqāt al-Maghribī al-Khalwatī, died 1794/1209. In Cairo, he went to his teacher's *murshid*. Al-Kurḍī revealed to

- him his future mission from revelations received in dream form. See B. G. Martin, "Notes sur l'origine de la *ṭarīqa* des Tijāniya et sur les début d'al-Ḥajj 'Umar," *Révue des Etudes Islamiques* 37 (1969): 267–290.
29. Abū 'l-Wafā' al-Ghunaymī al-Taftazānī, "Al-Ṭuruq al-ṣūfiya fī Miṣr," *Majallat Kulliyat al-Adab* 25 (1963): 66.
 30. M. Ghayth, "Shaykh al-Azhar fī 'l-qarn al-thāmin 'ashar," in *Al-Majalla al-tārīkhīya al-miṣriya*, pp. 272–282; al-Jabartī, 'Aja'ib al-athār fī 'l-tarājīm wa'l-akhbār, III, 192; IV, 170–173; V, 159–166.
 31. Al-Bayṭār (*Ḥilyat al-bāshir fī tārīkh al-qarn al-thālith 'ashar*, III, 1558–1559) gave the life of al-Sayyid Muṣṭafā al-Damanhūrī al-Shāfi'ī al-Miṣrī al-Azharī, died 1798/1213. He was deeply interested in the study of history and had read (parts of?) the *Sulūk* and the *Khiṭaṭ* of al-Maqrizī, the *Tārīkh al-'aynī* of al-Sakhāwī, and others. Al-Sharqāwī himself studied history.
 32. Ibid., II, 1088, for his student Shaykh 'Alī al-Ḥiṣawī al-Shāfi'ī (died 1816/1231). In Chapter 7 the religious texts which he taught al-'Aṭṭār will be discussed.
 33. Al-Bayṭār, *Ḥilyat al-bāshir fī tārīkh al-qarn al-thālith 'ashar*, II, 1068–1070, from the life of 'Alī b. Muḥammad al-Qināwī al-Miṣrī al-Shāfi'ī al-Khalwatī, who died after 1785/1200. It is probable that the *dhikr* used the colloquial language along with classical Arabic, as well as music.
 34. 'Alī b. Maḥmūd al-Khalwatī (*Hadha minḥat al-majīd 'alā sayf al-murīd*, p. 56) and al-Bayṭār (*Ḥilyat al-bāshir fī tārīkh al-qarn al-thālith 'ashar*, III, 1411) give an account of perhaps the only real recluse of the late eighteenth century in Egypt. This man was said to have left his house only twenty-one times in his life.
 35. Muṣṭafā Yūsuf Salām al-Shādhilī, *Jawāhir al-iṭtilā' wa durr al-intifa' 'alā matn Ibn Shajā'* contains a number of al-Bayyūmī's essays on the margin and following the main text.
 36. 'Alī al-Bayyūmī, *Al-Muntakhab*, copied by Ibn Shabha, in Salām, *Jawāhir al-iṭtilā' wa durr al-intifa' 'alā matn Ibn Shajā'*, pp. 3–147 (margin), which deals with differences between the four rites, an unusual topic in this period. See esp. p. 70.
 37. Al-Bayṭār, *Ḥilyat al-bāshir fī tārīkh al-qarn al-thālith 'ashar*, III, 1545–1552. Whether he was related to the Khalwatī shaykh Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Ṣawī (died 1825/1241) could not be determined. The son Muṣṭafā had some relationship with al-Azhar, according to the same biography. He moved to the Ḥusayniya quarter to study with Shaykh 'Īsā al-Barmāwī. The Ṣūfī al-Ṣawī died in Mecca, there being some indication that his order, the al-Ṣawīya, spread there as a consequence of the Wahhābīs' defeat.
 38. Salām, *Jawāhir al-iṭtilā' wa durr al-intifa' 'alā matn Ibn Shajā'*, pp. 177–234 (margin), esp. pp. 177–178, 182.
 39. Ibid., p. 202.
 40. Ibid., pp. 204–205.
 41. Moreh, "The Sociological Role of the Ṣūfī Shaykh in Eighteenth-Century Egypt," p. 389, citing al-Jabartī ('Aja'ib al-athār fī 'l-tarājīm wa'l-akhbār, IV, 128); al-Taftazānī ("Al-Ṭuruq al-ṣūfiya fī Miṣr," *Majallat Kulliyat al-Adab* 25 [1963]: 64) arrived at the conclusion that the radical Ṣūfī orders spread to Egypt only in Ottoman times and that they were distinct from the popular orders which came with the first Mamlūk era.
 42. Rodinson, *Islam et capitalisme*, pp. 33–34 and passim.
 43. Ibid., p. 35.

44. Muḥammad Murtaḍā al-Zabīdī, *Taj al-‘arūs min sharḥ jawāhir al-qāmūs*, VII, 294.
45. *Ibid.*, I, 455–456.
46. Al-Zabīdī, *Ithāf al-sādāt al-muttaqīn bi sharḥ asrār ihyā’ ‘ulūm al-dīn*, V, 417.
This is discussed by Hellmuth Ritter in “Ein arabisches Handbuch der Handelswissenschaft,” *Der Islam* 7 (1919): 32; Rodinson, *Islam et capitalisme*, p. 124. Al-Zabīdī taught the *Sunan* of al-Dārimī among which it is cited that the sincere merchant will be among the prophets on the Day of Judgment (Rodinson, *Islam et capitalisme*, pp. 33, 256 n. 17). Al-Ghazzālī was attacked by Ibn al-Jawzī for his use of suspect *ḥadīth*. The *Ithāf* of al-Zabīdī was especially devoted to the study of al-Ghazzālī’s *ḥadīth* (cf. Goldziher, *Muhammadan Studies*, II, 146).
47. Al-Ghazzālī, *Ihyā’ ‘ulūm al-dīn*, II, 48ff, cited in Neffening, “Tidjāra,” *Encyclopedia of Islam*, 1st ed., III, 747–751.
48. ‘Abdullah al-Sharqāwī, *Fath al-mubdī bi sharḥ mukhtaṣar al-Zabīdī*, II, 176.
This appeared in the chapter on selling. The key phrase was “al-iktisāb lā yunāfi al-tawakkul” (profit-making does not negate personal piety). This is in contradiction to the view which holds that *al-tawakkul* is an obstacle to commercial practices.
49. *Ibid.*, II, 214. This appeared in a chapter on agriculture. The resort to a naturalistic explanation was novel. One is tempted to see it as the view of a man who was deeply involved in urban commercial affairs and at the same time a *multazim*.
50. Muṣṭafā al-Bakrī, *Risāla fī rudd ‘alā man’ al-ziyāra li qubūr al-anbiyā’ wa’l-awliyā’* (“Al-Bakrī’s essay in reply to the objection to visiting the tombs of the prophets and saints”), pp. 310–316.
51. *Ibid.*, pp. 312–313. Al-Bakrī acknowledged that he himself frequently visited tombs and that he had heard that ‘Abd al-Ghanī al-Nābulusī had told people that visiting tombs might lead to the revelation of future events. That this had actually happened to Sīdī Ḥasan al-Rā’ī, who learned that he was going to be ordered to leave his village, is adduced; al-Bakrī also mentioned (*Risālat al-Bakrī fī rudd ‘alā man’ al-ziyāra li qubūr al-anbiyā’ wa’l-awliyā’*, pp. 310–316) that, according to a *ḥadīth*, God’s pardon could be obtained only by visiting the tombs of one’s parents on Friday and reciting the *Sūrat al-Yāsin*.
52. ‘Abdullah al-Majīd b. al-‘Arīf billah Shaykh ‘Alī al-‘Udwī, “Ḥadhihi risālat al-tabshīr fī faḍl man banī masjidān aw farrasha bi’l-ḥaṣīr,” folio 2A. The author then cited a *ḥadīth* on putting candles in the wall of a mosque. The *ḥadīth* said that he who lightens a mosque will have God’s light fall on him. Then he cited a similar *ḥadīth* regarding the rewards which will come to those who put cloth on the tombs (folio 7A).
53. Moreh (“The Sociological Role of the Ṣūfī Shaykh in Eighteenth-Century Egypt,” pp. 181–183) observed that there was a rather close relationship between *iftā’* and Ṣūfī *shaykhs* in the eighteenth century. He cites a number of examples. He also claims that a number of works in *fiqh* were written by eighteenth-century Ṣūfis. This seems eminently sound.
54. Al-Jabartī, *‘Ajā’ib al-aṭhār fī’l-tarājim wa’l-akhbār*, IV, 233–235. A later mufti of the Mālikīs collected al-Amīr’s decisions in *Khatmat al-majmū‘ li’l-Shaykh al-Amīr*. There is also a *Fatāwī al-Shaykh al-Amīr*.
55. Al-Bayṭār, *Hilyat al-bāshir fī tarīkh al-qam al-thālith ‘ashar*, III, 1564–1565.
Ahmad al-‘Arūsī was made a Qāḍī during the time of Napoleon. He had some connections to the Syrian *riwāq* in the past and was a close friend of Ḥasan al-Jabartī.
56. Statistics will be presented. They are based on the manuscript holdings of the

mosque library of al-Azhar: Abu'l-Wafā' al-Marāghī, *Fihris al-kutub al-mawjūda bi'l-maktaba al-Azhariya ilā 1952/1371*.

57. Ibid., I, 439–458.
58. Ibid., I, 399–406, 561–563, 557–559.
59. Brockelmann, *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur*, S2, pp. 415–424, listed some five *shaykhs* (including members of the Wafā'iya and Khalwatiya) who wrote in *ḥadīth*, comprising a dozen works in all, but there is no extensive commentary on these. In contrast to these is *Munẓūmat al-bayqūniya*, by Shaykh 'Umar b. Muḥammad b. Fattūḥ al-Bayqūnī, died 1669/1082.
60. Brockelmann, *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur*, S2, p. 419.
61. *Sharḥ Sīdī al-Zurqānī 'alā al-manẓūma al-musammā bi'l-bayqūniya fi muṣṭalah al-ḥadīth*, published with the major eighteenth-century gloss in the margin by 'Aṭīya al-Ajhūrī.
62. Al-Kilānī, *Al-Adab al-Miṣrī fī zill al-ḥukm al-'uthmānī*, p. 125; al-Zabīdī, *Tāj al-'arūs min sharḥ Jawāhir al-qāmūs*, VII, 380. He stated in connection with *ḥadīth* studies that he had received more than four hundred *ijāzas* (special and general) in Ḥaramayn, Yaman, Egypt, and Jerusalem. One study of his life located more of his manuscripts and established the identity of his *ḥadīth* teachers in Zabīd: in al-Zabīdī, "Tarwīḥ al-qulūb fī dhikr al-mulūk banī Ayyūb," ed. Ṣalāḥ al-dīn al-Munajjid. He wrote this work on *insāb* (genealogy) after his first period in Cairo, 1773/1187.
63. See a heretofore unknown manuscript, "Samā' li 'allāmat 'Abd al-Rahman b. Hasan al-Jabartī 'alā al-'allāma Muḥammad Murtaḍā al-Ḥusaynī" (1780/1194), one folio. Ḥasan al-Jabartī also studied with him. Shaybūb, 'Abd al-Rahman al-Jabartī, p. 39.
64. One might note that four different copies of the *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, dating from between 1775/1189 and 1780/1195, carry his signature.
65. Al-Zabīdī, "Ijāza Mustafa Efendi al-Qaysuri."
66. Al-Zabīdī, "Sanad al-Zabīdī bi ḥadīth al-raḥma al-musalsal bi'l-awwaliya thalāthiyāt al-Bukhārī."
67. Shaybūb, 'Abd al-Rahman al-Jabartī, p. 41.
68. Al-Zabīdī, "Ijāza ilā Mustafa Efendi al-Shahīr bi Bek Zadeh." This student also read other works on *ḥadīth* with al-Zabīdī, such as *Al-Jāmi' al-ṣaḥīḥ*. Other students included Mustafa Bey al-Iskandarani, Ayyub Bey al-Daftardar, and his great patron, Muḥammad Pasha 'Izzat, who gave him wealth in 1777/1191.
69. This *shaykh* received an *ijāza* from al-Zabīdī on the *Thabat al-Nakhli* known as *Bughyat al-ṭālibīn li bay'at al-masā'ih al-mu'tamidīn*. Al-Zabīdī, *Ḥikmat al-ishraq ilā kuttāb al-āfaq*, ed. 'Abd al-Salām Hārūn, pp. 49–98.
70. Al-Zabīdī, "Ijāza ilā Muḥammad Ṣādiq . . . bi samā' ihi 'alayhi al-ḥadīth al-awwal min kitāb al-aḥādīth al-thamāniya al-muntakhaba min nawādir al-usūl al-'āliya," by Imām Ibn al-Qiṣṣā 'Alī b. Ibrāhīm b. Aḥmad al-Buljī al-Shāfi'i, dated 1776/1190.
71. Al-Zabīdī, "Ijāza ilā Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-firqī al-Zakī," 1780/1195. Another *ijāza* is appended to this to an unnamed student in geography, history, and the *Aḥādīth Manṣūr b. Aḥmad*, which he also studied by the method of *al-musalsal bi'l-awwaliya*.
72. Al-Zabīdī, "Samā' li'l-'allāma Yūsuf b. Aḥmad al-'Aqqād al-Dīnashqī," 1780/1195.
73. Shaybūb ('Abd al-Rahman al-Jabartī, p. 41) mentions that they studied standard works, such as the *Shama'il*, the *Amālī*, and the *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*. These

- students are also mentioned by another source: al-Zabīdī, *Ḥikmat al-ishrāq*, p. 55. These students also studied lexicography with him. Another student who was probably an Egyptian was 'Alī b. 'Abdullah b. Aḥmad (*ijāza* from al-Zabīdī dated 1775/1189).
74. Shaybūb, *'Abd al-Raḥman al-Jabartī*, p. 39. See also al-Marāghī, *Fihris al-kutub al-mawjūda bi'l-maktaba al-azhariya*, I, 441, 454, 452, for a number of unidentified *ijāzas* of al-Zabīdī in *ḥadīth*. For example, see the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of al-Bukhārī. Rosetta had its own *ḥadīth* scholars, such as Shaykh Aḥmad al-Khuḍarī, with whom 'Abd al-Raḥman al-Jabartī studied when he visited Rosetta around 1775 (Shaybūb, *'Abd al-Raḥman al-Jabartī*, pp. 35–36). It would be interesting to see if *ḥadīth* studies were colored by local problems in the towns of the Delta during this period.
 75. Shaybūb, *'Abd al-Raḥman al-Jabartī*, p. 39; al-Zabīdī (*Tāj al-'arūs min sharḥ Jawāhir al-Qāmūs*, VII, 380) cites an example of such a work (it could not be located), *Al-Mirqāt al-'uliya fī sharḥ al-ḥadīth al-musalsal bi'l-awwaliya*, which he described as a presentation of *aḥādīth* with their complete chains and all their conditions.
 76. Al-Zabīdī, *Ḥikmat al-ishrāq*, pp. 54–55.
 77. A discussion of these works follows in the appropriate sections of the next chapter. One of his works in *ḥadīth* is "Manzūmat al-Ṣabbān fī dabṭ asmā' rijāl ṣaḥīḥayn al-Imāmī al-Bukhārī wa Muslim wa al-Muwāṭṭā'," folios 46–62.
 78. Ibid., folio 1B; an article on Islamic evaluation of *ḥadīth* is forthcoming.
 79. Al-Jabartī, *'Aja'ib al-āthār fī l-tarājim wa'l-akhbār*, I, 291. He stated that al-Ḥifnāwī had more than fifty students. Among the works in *ḥadīth* which he wrote (but which could not be located) was his *Ḥāshiya 'ala sharḥ al-'Azīz li'l-jāmi' al-ṣaḥīḥ*. His teaching of *ḥadīth* was also characterized by concern for unbroken chains.
 80. Aḥmad al-Dardīr, "Fath al-qadīr fī aḥādīth al-bashīr," folio 1B. In 8B he refers to an earlier work in *ḥadīth* on *asānīd* which he wrote (not identified).
 81. Al-Sharqāwī, *Fath al-mubdī*, I, 2.

3. The Cultural Revival of the Late Eighteenth Century

1. J. Heyworth-Dunne, "Arabic Literature in Egypt in the Eighteenth Century with Some Reference to the Poetry and the Poets," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 9 (1937–1939): 675–689.
2. *Al-Fawā'ih al-jinānīya* is Dār al-Kutub 1487 Al-Adab. See *ibid.*, p. 683. Al-Idkāwī had a wide range of literary friends and associates. There was a litterateur who knew three languages, a parodist, and a musician.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 684, dismisses the *Wafā'īya* on the basis of their small size. The best analysis to date is al-Kilānī, *Al-Adab al-miṣrī fī zill al-ḥukm al-'uthmānī*.
4. Al-Jabartī, *'Aja'ib al-āthār fī l-tarājim wa'l-akhbār*, II, 111, 114–115. Although Amīr had come from a family of *multazimīn* in Upper Egypt, he was still an outsider in Cairo. Here we see an example of a conflict which carries on through the early nineteenth century, as in the al-'Attār–Sānūsī conflict Chapters 5–7. Even in the earlier *Al-Fawā'ih al-jinānīya* there was a *muwashshaha* opposing an Andalusian model of Ibn al-Khatīb. Muhammad 'Abd al-Ghanī Hasan claims that a similar opposition to Andalusian forms is found in the Fatimid period (see *Ḥuṣn al-'Attār*, p. 68).

5. Al-Jabartī, *‘Ajā’ib al-āthār fī l-tarājim wa’l-akhbār*, II, 184–187. Qasim and al-‘Awḍī had wide literary contacts. Qasim was a close friend of the literary figure Shaykh Amīr al-Zurqānī. He also met with a preacher at Ḥusayn mosque and a poet from al-Manṣūra.
6. Ibid., I, 265–283; II, 186–187; ‘Umar Riḍā Kakhālā (*Mu‘jam al-mu‘allifin wa tarājim al-‘arabiya*, IX, 318) lists three works, one a *maqāma*.
7. Isma‘īl al-Khashshāb, *Dirwān al-Khashshāb*, edited by his friend Ḥasan al-‘Aṭṭār. It included the *takniya*: al-Sayyid al-Sharīf Abū’l-Ḥasan.
8. Ibid., pp. 353–363. Shaybūb (*‘Abd al-Raḥman al-Jabartī*, p. 42) cites a poem in praise of his teacher al-Zabīdī (pp. 364–365), one in praise of his friend al-Jabartī (p. 374), and one in praise of another teacher, Muḥammad al-Amīr.
9. Charles Pellat, “Al-Ḥarīrī,” *Encyclopedia of Islam*, 2d ed., III, 121–122; Brockelmann, “Maḳāma,” *Encyclopedia of Islam*, 1st ed., III, 161–164.
10. Al-Khafājī wrote on al-Ḥarīrī’s *Durrat al-ghawwās fī awhām al-khawāṣṣ*, which dealt with incorrect usages of certain expressions. Al-Khafājī disputed a number of al-Ḥarīrī’s assertions. See Pellat, “Al-Ḥarīrī,” and Brockelmann, *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur*, S2, p. 487. For the life of al-Khafājī, see al-Kilānī, *Al-Adab al-miṣrī fī ḡill al-ḥukm al-‘uthmānī*, pp. 276–280.
11. Heyworth-Dunne, *Introduction to the History of Education in Modern Egypt*, pp. 76–77.
12. Al-Jabartī, *‘Ajā’ib al-āthār fī l-tarājim wa’l-akhbār*, I, 159.
13. Ibid., I, 179. This is of some interest, because the *beys* were reputed to have a negligible knowledge of Arabic.
14. Ibid., II, 35.
15. Ibid., II, 57.
16. Ibid., II, 96. Mulla Darwish died in 1784/1199.
17. Ibid., II, 96–97.
18. Al-Zabīdī, *Ḥikmat al-ishrāq ilā kuttāb al-afāq*, p. 55; al-Shiblānī, *Nūr al-abṣār fī manāqib al-bayt al-nabī al-Mukhtār*, p. 174; al-Kattānī, *Fihris al-fahāris wa athbāt wa mu‘jam al-ma‘ājim wa’l-mashikhhāt wa’l-musalsalāt*, I, 398–413.
19. Al-Zabīdī, *Risālat nash‘at al-irtiyāḥ fī ḥaqīqat al-maysir wa’l-qidāḥ*, ed. Carlo von Landberg, in *Primeurs Arabes*, I. There is an essay explaining why certain pre-Islamic games were forbidden (pp. 39–55).
20. Al-Zabīdī, *Ḥikmat al-ishrāq ilā kuttāb al-afāq*, introduction, p. 60.
21. Al-Zabīdī, “Tuḥfat al-qamā‘īl fī madīḥ Shaykh al-‘Arab Isma‘īl.” This genealogical study of a Hawwāra chief reflected many of al-Zabīdī’s interests; Brockelmann, “Maḳāma,” *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur*, III, 161–164.
22. Pierre Cachia (Ṭaha Ḥusayn: *His Place in the Egyptian Literary Renaissance*, p. 5) comments that Aḥmad al-Dardīr wrote heavy, repetitive *maqāmāt* with a characteristic use of *tashṭīr* and *takhmīs*, in which quotes from al-Ḥarīrī and other classics were “diluted” through inserts of his own. Brockelmann (“Maḳāma,” *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur*, III, 161–164) distinguished between the decadence of the eighteenth century and the revival of the *maqāma* in the nineteenth century with al-Yazījī.
23. Al-Sijā‘ī made it clear that the choice of this model by a Jewish poet was made for its eloquence in Arabic. Al-‘Aṭṭār also edited a work by a poet of Jewish origin, but found it necessary to append a theological justification for doing so. His period was much less liberal in certain aspects.

24. Ibn Khaldūn, *The Muqaddimah*, ed. Franz Rosenthal, III, 330. Al-Zabīdī taught the work of al-Thaʿalibī (Brockelmann, *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur*, S1, p. 499).
25. Jaroslav Stetkevych, *The Modern Arabic Literary Language*. This book disputes the existence of such a dichotomy (chap. 1). The author demonstrates that, for example, the Baṣra school, including such figures as ʿUthmān b. al-Jinnī, relied in a formative period on the use of analogy. Stetkevych shows, however, that the most extensive use of analogy has been in recent times. This is so, he says, because Arabic culture developed more organically in the Middle Ages than it could in modern times.
26. Zayn al-dīn al-Rāzī, *Mukhtār al-Ṣiḥāḥ* (1760/1358), a version of the *Ṣiḥāḥ al-Jawharī* of Ismaʿīl b. Ḥamid al-Jawharī (died 1099/393). See al-Marāghī, *Fihris al-kutub al-mawjūda biʾl-maktaba al-azhariya*, IV, 31, in the section called "Al-lughā."
27. Muḥammad b. al-Ṭib al-Fāṣī, "Iḍāʾat al-rāmūs wa ifāḍat al-nāmūs 'alā iddī'ā' al-qāmūs," a commentary on al-Firūzabādī (3 vols.). The next scholar to comment on this text was al-Zabīdī.
28. Ibid., I, folio 1a.
29. Ibid., I, folios 7a–8b, on al-Shirāzī's (al-Firūzabādī's) use of *ḥadīth* (19a).
30. ʿAbdullah ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ Darwish, "Al-Khalīl Ibn Aḥmad and the Evolution of Arabic Lexicography" (doctoral dissertation). This study and others treat al-Zabīdī as the last of the traditional writers of dictionaries on the basis of the organization he follows and on the basis that his work is a commentary and not an "independent" work. However, in the printed edition of the *Tāj*, referred to above, an index of the location of the letters in the beginning of the first volume makes it very convenient even for the "modern" reader to use. The difference is actually rather small, whether one starts with the first radical or the last. The actual significance of this system lies more in the shift of dictionaries away from the needs of poets.
31. Al-Zabīdī, *Ḥikmat al-ishrāq ilā kuttāb al-afāq*, introduction, p. 56.
32. L. Kopf, "Religious Influences on Mediaeval Arabic Philology," *Studia Islamica* 5 (1956): 49–50. Cf. Muḥammad al-Amīr, *Ḥāshiyat al-Amīr 'alā sharḥ al-azhariya*, p. 7.
33. Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon*, p. xviii, especially the *Lisan al-ʿarab* of Ibn al-Manzur.
34. Anwar Chejne, *The Arabic Language*, p. 45.
35. Ḥasan al-Quwayḍār (died 1848/1262), a student of language with Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār, wrote a work in lexicography called "Taqrīrāt Quwayḍār 'alā manzūmatihi fī muthallathāt al-musammā bi nīl al-ʿarab fī muthallathāt al-ʿarab."
36. Not all *shaykhs* of al-Azhar followed the main texts, but this was the basis of the teaching program. For an exception, see Ḥasan al-Jabartī, "Sharḥ Ḥasan al-Jabartī 'alā risālat al-shurūʿ allatī allafahā ʿAbbās Efendī fī ʾl-shurūʿ waʾl-ajzaʾ," folios 13–27, 1758/1172.
37. Muḥammad al-Ṣabbān, *Ḥāshiyat al-Ṣabbān 'alā sharḥ al-Ashmūnī 'alā alfiyat Ibn Malik*. This was written in 1779/1193; see I, 2. Throughout this work al-Ṣabbān's general concern with language through *ḥadīth* studies appears.
38. Prior to this there was only one Egyptian, Ahmad al-Mallāwī in 1753/1146. Before al-Mallāwī, there had been the Indian Naqshbandī ʿAbd al-Hikīm al-Sayālkūtī (died 1656/1067), Mullā Ḥasan Chalabī al-Fanarī (died 1480/885), Mīr Dajān

- (Ḥabībullah al-Shirāzī, died 1555/993). Paradoxically, these writers are increasingly important as rationalist sources in the nineteenth century (see below, Chapters 6–7).
39. Muḥammad 'Arafa al-Disūqī, "Ḥāshiyat al-Disūqī 'alā sharḥ Sa'd al-dīn al-Taftazānī 'alā matn al-talkhīṣ" (2 vols.), dated 1795/1210. Al-Disūqī attributed his learning in part to his teacher 'Alī al-'Idwī.
 40. Muḥammad al-Ḥifnāwī, "Ḥāshiyat al-Ḥifnāwī 'alā sharḥ Abī Laythi al-Samarqandī 'alā al-risāla al-waḍ'īya al-'aḍudīya," folios 83–123 (1761/1175), folio 83B.
 41. The main work was only forty pages long and was written in 1769/1183 by Muḥammad al-Ṣabbān ("Sharḥ al-Ṣabbān 'alā manẓūmatihī fī 'l-'urūd al-musammā al-kifāya al-shāfi'ya fī 'ilmay al-'urūd wa'l-qafīya"). There are also minor essays by al-Shubrāwī and al-Sijā'ī. Of these works those of al-Shubrāwī deserve some attention because he alone had a simplified and clear style.
 42. Amīr Ahmad al-Dimirdash Katkhuda al-Azab, "Kitāb al-durra al-muṣāna' fī akhbār al-kināna fī akhbār min mā waqa'a fī dawlat al-mamālik min al-sanājiq wa'l-dawla wa 'awā'idihim wa'l-bāshā" (2 vols.), I, 1, dated 1754/1168.
 43. Ibid., I, 180–182, 188, 304. For his visit to the Imām al-Shāfi'ī, see II, 556.
 44. Ibid., I, 38, 131, 187.
 45. Al-Ḥājī Muṣṭafā al-Ḥājī Ibrāhīm, "Tārīkh waqā'i' Miṣr al-Qāhira," 1739/1152. The author introduces himself as a follower of the late Hasan al-Azab al-Dimirdashi.
 46. Isma'il al-Khashshāb, *Khulaṣat mā yurād min akhbār al-amīr Murād* (18 Muḥarram 1215/May 1801), cited by Brockelmann, *Geschichte der Arabischen Literatur*, S2, p. 720. See below, Chapter 4; al-Khashshāb, "Tadhkara li ahl al-baṣā'ir wa'l-abṣār ma'a wajh al-ikhtīṣār"; also 'Abdullah al-Sharqāwī, *Tuḥfat al-nāziṛin fī man walī Miṣr fī wilāyat al-Salāṭin* (1892/1310).
 47. Brockelmann (*Geschichte der Arabischen Literatur*) neither lists these works for the most part, nor gives Badr as a genre; Peacock, "Mystics and Merchants in Fourteenth Century Germany," p. 48.
 48. Muḥammad al-Ṣabbān, "Manẓūmat asmā' ahl Badr" (1757/1171), pp. 361–369.
 49. Muṣṭafā al-Banānī, "Ḥadhihi al-kitāb rawḍat al-ṭālibīn li asmā' al-ṣaḥāba al-Badrīyin" (1791/1206).
 50. 'Abdullah al-Shubrāwī, *Ḥadhihi kitāb sharḥ al-ṣadr bi ghazwāt Badr*. For original, see Brockelmann, *Geschichte der Arabischen Literatur*, GAL 2, p. 282.
 51. Muḥammad b. Salīm al-Ḥifnāwī, *Al-Thamāra al-baḥīya fī 'l-ṣaḥāba al-badrīya*, pp. 15–16.
 52. Ibid., p. 35. Another writer (one of his disciples) appeared to have reservations about this elevation of the Badrīyin (or the way the Wafā'īya elevated the ṣaḥāba who were buried in Egypt). 'Abdullah al-Sharqāwī (*Faṭḥ al-mubdī*, III, 113) states that, while the *shuhadā'* of the Battle of Badr are dead, and the dead cannot hear, God has granted a life to these martyrs.
 53. Jamāl al-dīn al-Shayyāl, *Al-Ḥarakāt al-iṣlahīya wa marākiz al-thaqāfa*, I, 96–103.
 54. Al-Kattānī, *Fihris al-fahāris wa athbāt wa mu'jam al-ma'ajim wa'l-mashāykhāt wa'l-musalsalāt*, I, 104–105.
 55. Al-Zabīdī, "Al-'Iqd al-mukallal bi'l-jawhar al-thamīn fī turuq al-ilbās wa'l-dhikr wa'l-talqīn" and "Safīnat al-najāh muḥtawiya 'alā bida'a muzjah min al-fawā'id al-muntaqah."
 56. This contrasts with the standard view which dissociates his work from the allegedly barren period in which he lived. It is commonly believed that the coming of the French deepened (modernized?) his understanding of history.

57. Al-Jabartī, *‘Ajā’ib al-āthār fī l-tarājim wa’l-akhbār*, I, 3. The “fusion” of different trends can be seen even in the wording of al-Jabartī’s title: *‘Ajā’ib al-āthār fī l-tarājim wa’l-akhbār*. “Tarājim” is deliberately used as a counterweight to “akhbār.” Compare to the work of al-Zabīdī’s student previously mentioned, the Algerian Abū Ra’s al-Naṣīrī (died 1822), author of *‘Ajā’ib al-Asfār wa laṭā’if al-Akhhār*.
58. Al-Jabartī, *‘Ajā’ib al-āthār fī l-tarājim wa’l-akhbār*, I, 3.
59. Ibid. Al-Jabartī’s allegiance to the chronological tradition of historical writing on the whole outweighs this commitment, although the reader of the chronological sections will find that the author included many items because of their moral value, and would draw a moral lesson from others. The indictment of his own generation concerning their neglect of history should be understood in this sense.
60. Ibid., I, 5.
61. Ibid., I, 4–5; a common view that al-Jabartī was unique is dismissed by reference to a similar historical work composed by a Tunisian contemporary of his who studied in al-Azhar but seemingly not with al-Zabīdī (Ahmed Abdesslem, *Les historiens tunisiens des XVII^e, XVIII^e, et XIX^e siècles*, p. 273).
62. Al-Jabartī, *‘Ajā’ib al-āthār fī l-tarājim wa’l-akhbār*, I, 10–12. The idea that justice can be maintained by a non-Muslim government, while not unprecedented in medieval political thought, was not common.
63. Anouar Abdel-Malek (*Idéologie et renaissance nationale de l’Egypte moderne*, p. 200 and passim) argues persuasively from the text his case in favor of al-Jabartī’s technical ability as a historian. This is in contrast to Richard Verdery’s attempt to “test” al-Jabartī against contemporary European sources, which he considered to be more accurate on some preconceived basis.

4. *The Decline of the Eighteenth-Century Cultural Revival*

1. ‘Alī Mubārak, *Al-Khiṭaṭ al-tawfiqīya al-jadīda*, IV, 38. No information concerning Asad (including information on whether or not he was al-‘Aṭṭār’s only son) could be located. Ibid., XVI, 72, stated that al-‘Aṭṭār came from the village of Minyā al-‘Aṭṭār. This is highly unlikely. For al-‘Aṭṭār’s later life, the main source is Aḥmad al-Ḥusaynī, “Sharḥ al-umm al-musammā bi murshid al-anām li birr umm al-imām.”
2. This work is referred to under various titles, for example, “Manzūma fī ‘ilm al-naḥw,” folios 114–117, and as *Petit traité de grammaire arabe en vers*, trans. J. Sicard (App. III, no. 39). See pp. 22, 30 for a comment on the fact that he wrote it in two days. How did the French in Algeria come to know about it a century later? Was this the first translation? We do know that al-‘Aṭṭār’s student Ḥasan al-Quwaydār wrote a commentary on this little work. It is entitled “Sharḥ Shaykh Ḥasan al-Quwaydār ‘alā manzūmat al-‘Aṭṭār fī l-naḥw” and is cited by ‘Umar al-Disūqī in *Fī l-adab al-ḥadīth*, I, 40.
3. Al-Jabartī, *‘Ajā’ib al-āthār fī l-tarājim wa’l-akhbār*, I, 177; II, 160, 169, 170.
4. Shaybūb, *‘Abd al-Raḥman al-Jabartī*, p. 63.
5. Ibid., p. 58. Earlier, perhaps around 1778, al-Jabartī was given the name Abū l-‘Azīm during the Mawlid al-Nabī.
6. Jamāl al-dīn al-Shayyāl. *A History of Egyptian Historiography in the Nineteenth Century*, p. 112.

7. See Chapter 3.
8. Shaybūb, *ʿAbd al-Raḥman al-Jabartī*, p. 3.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 9.
10. Shayyāl, *A History of Egyptian Historiography*, p. 112; al-Jabartī, *ʿAjdʿib al-aṯar fī l-tarājim wa l-akhbār*, IV, 28 (contains al-ʿAṭṭār’s poetry); Georges Douin, “L’ambassade d’Elfi Bey à Londres Octobre–Decembre 1803,” *Bulletin de l’Institut de l’Egypte* 2 (1925): 100; Shaybūb, *ʿAbd al-Raḥman al-Jabartī*, p. 100 (on al-Jabartī).
11. This work served as the obvious but unacknowledged source for the essay by Delaporte called “Abrégé chronologique de l’histoire des Mamlouks d’Egypte,” in *Déscription de l’Egypte—Etat Moderne*, II (part 1), 165 ff. This is drawn quite literally from al-Khashshāb, “Khulāṣat mā yurād min akhbār al-Amīr Murād.” For a comment see P. Holt (ed.), *Political and Social Change in Modern Egypt*, p. 12.
12. Al-Jabartī realigned the *miḥrāb* of Jāmiʿ Abū Ḥuraira Mosque in Giza. He stressed that in doing this, he relied on his father’s books (Shaybūb, *ʿAbd al-Raḥman al-Jabartī*, p. 11).
13. Al-Jabartī, *Mazhar al-taqdis fī dhahāb dawlat al-faransts*, pp. 14, 382; al-Jabartī used some poetry and letters which al-ʿAṭṭār wrote in 1798 in Asyūt. Al-Jabartī’s book was quickly recognized in Turkey, and this may have facilitated al-ʿAṭṭār’s travels and intellectual contacts there. The *Mazhar* was completed in 1801/1216 and was translated in 1810/1225 by Mulla ul-Fadil ul-Sayyid Ahmed Efendi Asim. Another interpretation concerning the writing of this book can be found in a dissertation which asserts that it was a work written to fend off criticism for the author’s contacts with the French in the Diwān. See Richard Verdery, “ʿAbd al-Raḥman al-Jabartī as a Source for the Early History of Muḥammad ʿAlī, 1807–1821” (doctoral dissertation), p. 12.
14. Peacock, “Mystics and Merchants in Fourteenth Century Germany”; M. Foucault, *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*.
15. Shaybūb, *ʿAbd al-Raḥman al-Jabartī*, pp. 63–65; Mubārak, *Al-Khiṭaṭ al-tawfiqiya al-jadida*, IV, 38.
16. “Ḥāshiyat al-ʿAṭṭār ʿalā sharḥ Shaykh Khālid al-Azhari” called “Muwāṣil al-ṭullāb ilā qawāʿid al-iʿrāb li ʿAbdullah b. Hishām al-Anṣārī” (dated 1794/1209, App. III, no. 42). Al-ʿAṭṭār did not directly mention the commentary composed by Muḥammad al-Amīr, although we may deduce it through his frequent references to “my shaykh,” for example, on pp. 89, 92, 103. On p. 100 he mentions “Shaykunā al-awwalī,” which would seem to refer to his old teacher or perhaps his first teacher, al-Amīr.
17. On a text called “Al-Samarqandiya” in rhetoric by Abū l-Qāsim b. Abī Bakr al-Laythī al-Samarqandī (died 1493). Brockelmann, *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur*, GAL II, p. 194.
18. Al-ʿAṭṭār, “Ḥāshiyat al-ʿAṭṭār ʿalā sharḥ Shaykh Khālid al-Azhari,” pp. 4–5.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 5; for comparison see Helmut Ritter (ed.), *Asrār al-balāgha (The Mysteries of Eloquence of ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī)*, esp. pp. 1–20.
20. Al-ʿAṭṭār, “Ḥadhihi al-risāla ʿalā Shaykh Khālid al-Azhari al-Jirjāwī fī sharḥ al-ajurrūmiya” (App. III, no. 41).
21. A minor example of an effort to make these distinctions arose (see folio 1B-2A) concerning the grammatical point of the “wa” of exception. This, al-ʿAṭṭār indicates, al-Azhari confused with a similar problem in *ʿilm al-bayān*. Al-ʿAṭṭār cites as his sources the glosses of ʿAbd al-Hakīm on *Al-Mutawakkil*

- and *Al-Khayyālī*, works on *kalam*. A large number of other errors also are pointed out.
22. This was a commentary on the work known as *Al-Azhariya* by Khālīd al-Azhari. Al-'Aṭṭār's gloss served as a basic text in grammar study in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (Heyworth-Dunne, *History of Education in Modern Egypt*, p. 58).
 23. Al-'Aṭṭār, *Hāshīya 'alā sharḥ Shaykh Khālīd 'alā al-azhariya*, p. 21 (App. III, no. 43). In some other cases, al-'Aṭṭār was dissatisfied with the system of classification which al-Azhari used; for example, see pp. 21, 23, and 27, esp. p. 29, where he stressed that classification is meant to be a utilitarian device.
 24. Al-'Aṭṭār's teacher wrote *Hāshiyat al-Amīr 'alā sharḥ al-azhariya* (1869/1286), praised Khālīd al-Azhari's *Commentary on al-Ājurrūmiya*.
 25. This point is not free from controversy, because Mubārak states (*Al-Khiṭaṭ al-tawfiqīya al-jadīda*, IV, 38) that al-'Aṭṭār deferred beginning his teaching in order to study certain other fields. Al-'Aṭṭār himself stated in his *Hāshīya 'alā sharḥ Shaykh Khālīd 'alā al-azhariya* (p. 2) that he was teaching it in al-Azhar when the French came. I naturally prefer to follow al-'Aṭṭār's own text and date his teaching from the 1790's.
 26. Al-'Aṭṭār, *Hāshīya 'alā sharḥ Shaykh Khālīd 'alā al-azhariya*, p. 119.
 27. Al-'Aṭṭār, "Risāla . . . 'alā . . . al-ājurrūmiya." On folios 2A and 2B, he attacked al-Sānūsī and defended al-Ash'arī. This was a main point for some Khalwati Ṣūfis. On 2A he asserted that he was familiar with the glosses of the *Mukhtaṣar al-Sānūsī fī'l-mantiq* (see Heyworth-Dunne, *History of Education in Modern Egypt*, p. 61) which criticized al-Ash'arī.
 28. Al-Amīr, *Hāshīya 'alā sharḥ matn mughnī al-labīb*, p. 34, for biographical information on Andalusian literary sources; idem, *Hāshīya 'alā sharḥ 'Abd al-Salām li jawharat al-tawḥīd li'l-Laḳānī*, pp. 53, 55, on the *Rihla* of Sīdī 'Abdullah al-'Ayyashī.
 29. Al-Khashshāb, *Diwān al-Khashshāb*, p. 345; al-Shayyāl, *Al-Ḥarakāt al-islāhiya wa marākiz al-thaqāfa*, II, 112; 'Abd al-Jawwād Ramaḍān, "Bayn al-'Aṭṭār wa'l-Khashshāb min udabā' al-qarn al-tāsi' 'ashar," *Majallat al-Azhar* 19 (1948), see esp. part 2 (Ṣafar, pp. 139–144) and part 3 (Rabī' al-Awwil, pp. 220–225).
 30. 'Abd al-Ghanī Ḥasan, *Hasan al-'Aṭṭār*, pp. 58–59, mentions the opposition of Isma'īl al-Ṭuhūrī al-Miṣrī al-Musīqī (died 1797/1212) to the *muwashshahāt* of Lisān al-dīn b. al-Khaṭṭīb.
 31. Al-'Aṭṭār, *Hadḥā . . . diwān . . . Ibrāhīm b. Sahl* (App. III, no. 77).
 32. See Chapter 3.
 33. Al-'Aṭṭār, *Hadḥā . . . diwān . . . Ibrāhīm b. Sahl*, pp. 2–3. This suggests that the original was a manuscript copy, somewhat different from the printed copy, which has no such marginalia.
 34. Ibid., p. 51. We might note before proceeding that al-'Aṭṭār had discussed al-Shalūbīn as early as the 1790's, suggesting that he may also have known his work at this time. See al-'Aṭṭār, *Hāshīya 'alā sharḥ . . . 'alā al-azhariya*, p. 118.
 35. Al-'Aṭṭār, *Hadḥā . . . diwān . . . Ibrāhīm b. Sahl*, pp. 52–55.
 36. Ibid., pp. 54–55.
 37. Al-'Aṭṭār, "Hāshīya 'alā sharḥ 'alā al-samarqandīya," pp. 17–18 (App. III, no. 52).
 38. Al-'Aṭṭār, "Hāshīya 'alā sharḥ 'alā qawā'id," p. 22, dating from 1794–95/1209.
 39. Al-'Aṭṭār, *Hāshīya 'alā sharḥ 'alā al-azhariya*, p. 119.

40. The new appointee, Shaykh Shāmil Aḥmad b. Ramaḍān b. Su‘ūd al-Ṭarābulī (al-Jabartī, *‘Aja’ib al-āthār fī l-tarājim wa’l-akhbār*, III, 114).
41. One might note that al-‘Aṭṭār rarely used the word *mawlāna* in his books, except for certain major Ṣūfī shaykhs, for example, Mawlāna Jalāl al-dīn al-Rūmī.
42. Ḥasan, *Ḥasan al-‘Aṭṭār*, pp. 91–92. Muḥammad al-Kilānī consecrated an entire book to the poems praising al-Azbakiya: *Fī ruba’ al-Azbakiya: Dirdsa adabiya, tarikhiya, ijtimaiya*.
43. Freely translated from the French: Are you for love? Willowy creature of Turkish stock, with moonlike visage composed of pearls, black eyes, pink cheeks, mouth whose nectar-flavored saliva has the sweetness of perfume (Al-‘Aṭṭār, *Petit traité*, p. 22, here somewhat suppressed by the French translator).
44. Al-‘Aṭṭār, *Al-Inshā’*, pp. 84–86 (App. III, no. 81).
45. Ibid., p. 78.
46. Al-Jabartī, *‘Aja’ib al-āthār fī l-tarājim wa’l-akhbār*, III, 109; Mubārak, *Al-Khiṭaṭ al-tawfiqiya al-jadida*, IX, 163; al-‘Aṭṭār, *Al-Inshā’*, p. 67; al-Jabartī, *Mazhar al-taqdis*, pp. 237–240.
47. Shaybūb, *‘Abd al-Raḥman al-Jabartī*, p. 70.
48. Moosa, “Napoleon’s Islamic Policy in Egypt,” p. 115 n. 1; al-Jabartī, *‘Aja’ib al-āthār fī l-tarājim wa’l-akhbār*, III, 44.
49. These statements should be contrasted with those of ‘Abdullah al-Sharqāwī, Shaykh al-Azhar and one of al-‘Aṭṭār’s teachers, and also with those of al-Jabartī, his friend. In *Tuḥfat al-nāzirīn*, published in Cairo in 1864, al-Sharqāwī echoed the earlier firman of Sultan Selim III against the French Revolution: “As regards the state of the French, they follow the naturalist philosophy and adhere to the judgment of reason. . . . to them the Prophets Muhammad, Jesus, and Moses were wise men and canonical laws attributed to them are tantamount to . . . statute” (pp. 65–66). Al-Jabartī, in “Muddat dukhul al-faransī bi Miṣr,” wrote that “the French are neither Christian, Muslim, nor Jew; that which is written of their doctrines is that they do not hold to any religion nor do they agree with any religious community; rather, every one of them follows a religion which he invents by his reason.” Al-Jabartī elsewhere accused them of being antireligious materialists. See Leon Zolondek, “The French Revolution in Arabic Literature in the Nineteenth Century,” *Muslim World* 57 (1967): 204–205. Zolondek was citing al-Sharqāwī, *Tuḥfat al-nāzirīn*, pp. 64–65, and al-Jabartī, “Muddat dukhul al-faransī bi Miṣr,” folio 5, and *Mazhar al-taqdis*, pp. 41–42. These quotations, as Zolondek points out, should be seen as written in self-defense against charges of their having cooperated with the French, and thus may be a slight exaggeration of their authors’ views, nonetheless, if compared to the above as a *mea culpa*, one can easily see how far removed al-‘Aṭṭār had become from the “official” Azhar milieu.
50. Al-‘Aṭṭār, *Ḥashiyat al-‘Aṭṭār ‘alā sharḥ ‘alā al-azhariya*, p. 2.
51. Ibid., p. 125. One might point out that the French were defeated in the year 1801 and that most had left already to be replaced by the British before al-‘Aṭṭār himself left.

5. Turkey and Syria in the Early Nineteenth Century

1. Alessio Bombaci, *Histoire de la littérature turque*, pp. 310–312.
2. Constantine Volney, *Voyage en l’Égypte et en Syrie*, p. 386 n. 7, Niyazi Berkes.

The Development of Secularism in Turkey, Chap. 1 and passim.

3. Rodinson, *Islam et Capitalisme*, pp. 135–136; Halil Inalcik, "Ḥarfī," *Encyclopedia of Islam*, 2d ed., III, 209–220, esp. p. 218.
4. M. A. Ubicini, *Letters on Turkey*, II, 339–344. This is quoted in Charles Issawi, *The Economic History of the Middle East, 1800–1914*, p. 43.
5. Uriel Heyd, "The Ottoman Ulema and Westernization in the Time of Selim III and Mahmud II," in *Studies in Islamic History and Civilization*, pp. 77–78. Heyd also cited such examples of corruption as refusal by the wealthy 'ulamā' to submit their gold and silver objects to the mint in compliance with the law. Outsiders managed to rise to high position through their political connections, for example, Cherkes Khalil, a slave boy and favorite of the Sultan Mahmud II, rose to become Shaykh ul-Islam (p. 81). The link of another Shaykh al-Islam, Velizade Mehmed Emin, to Sultan Selim was also quite clear (p. 80).
6. Berkes, *Development of Secularism in Turkey*, pp. 82–83.
7. T.-X. Bianchi, "Récueil de Fetvas," *Journal Asiatique* 1st ser., 2 (1822): 3–16.
8. John Kinsley Birge, *The Bektashi Order of Dervishes*, pp. 77–78.
9. Wadī' 'Abdullah Qasṭūn, *Al-Afrānj fī Ḥalab fī'l-qam al-thāmin 'ashar*, pp. 39–55, 197.
10. Robert Haddad, *Syrian Christians in Muslim Society*, pp. 47, 51, 60–61.
11. Albert Hourani, "The Syrians of Egypt in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries," in *Colloque Internationale sur l'Histoire du Caire*. The role of the Syrian Christians in Syria is not well known. In Egypt in the time of Muḥammad 'Alī, such figures as 'Anḥūrī, Fara'ūn, Sakākīnī, and Niqūlā Musābikī played important roles in cultural development.
12. 'Abd al-Raḥīm, *Al-Dawla al su'ūdiyya al-ūlā*, pp. 202–210.
13. Das Gupta, "Trade and Politics in the Eighteenth Century in India," pp. 181, 195; Abir, "The 'Arab Rebellion' of Amīr Ghālib of Mecca, 1788–1813."
14. Henri Guys, *Esquisse de l'état politique et commerciale de la Syrie*, p. 152. The author, in explaining the steady decline in direct French-Syrian trade between 1775 and 1846, attributed it to the direct European penetration of Persia which cut out the Syrian position as middle man.
15. The intellectual division of labor in the Ottoman Empire will be discussed in a forthcoming article.
16. This route is suggested by his student Muḥammad al-'Aṭṭār, who wrote a short biographical note, "Sharḥ al-'Aṭṭār 'alā manzūmat Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār fī'l-tashrīḥ," folio 49B, dated 1808/1223.
17. Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār, "Ḥashīyat al-'Aṭṭār 'alā sharḥ Qādī Zadeh 'alā ta'sīs al-ashkāl," folio 100B, dated 1821/1237 (App. III, no. 23).
18. Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār, "Ḥashīyat al-'Aṭṭār 'alā natā'ij al-afkār fī'l-naḥw," dated 1805/1222, p. 407 (App. III, no. 44).
19. Ibid., pp. 252, 406. See also al-'Aṭṭār, "Rāḥat al-abdān bi sharḥ nuzhat al-adhḥān al-Anṭākī," folio 250B, dated 1813/1228 (App. III, n. 66); idem, *Ḥashīya 'alā sharḥ jāmi' al-jawāmi'*, II, 150 (App. III, n. 4), which states that he was in Istanbul twice.
20. Al-'Aṭṭār, *Al-Inshā'*, pp. 67–68, praised the Turkish grammar of Ḥafid Efendi and stated that he studied and learned composition from it. He may have met its author.
21. In ibid., pp. 58–60, al-'Aṭṭār wrote, in a section on praise, "Praise for a book which the Şeyh ul-Islam Ataullah Efendi composed in which he refuted the beliefs of the people of falsehood [qawm al-mubatilīn]." In this praise, he referred to the Şeyh ul-Islam's light as conquering the land of the enemy. Another reference

- is made to the soldiers who will disperse the darkness of night, and finally the use of the word "*yarudd bi*" in al-'Aṭṭār's title points to a work directed against the Wahhābīs by the Şeyh ul-Islam called "Sharḥ 'alā risālat Qādī Makka min sanat 1210 ruddan 'alā jamā'at 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Wahhābī ṣāhib al-Dar'īya wa ibṭāl 'aḡā'idihim," listed in Dār al-Kutub, 101 Majāmi', al-Tawhīd. The repetition of words in the title and in the *inshā'* is clear enough. See Kahhala, *Mu'jam al-Mu'allifin wa tarājim al-'arabiya*, X, 292. Al-Baghdādī (*Hidāyat al-'arifin asma' al-mu'allifin āthār al-musannifin*, II, 356), in his account of the Şeyh ul-Islam, stated that he wrote "Sharḥ 'alā al-risāla al-ruddiyya 'alā al-ṭā'ifa al-Wahhābiyya." There are no grounds for doubting that this is the same work as the one listed in Dār al-Kutub.
22. Berkes, *Development of Secularism in Turkey*, pp. 82–83; Heyd, "Ottoman Ulama and Westernization."
 23. Al-'Aṭṭār, *Ḥaṣhiyya 'alā sharḥ jamī' al-jawāmi'*, II, 524. In this work, al-'Aṭṭār identified the figure as Şeyh ul-Islam Arab-Zadeh. This was no doubt Arabzade Mehmed Arif Efendi, who actually rose to the position Şeyh ul-Islam for a brief period in 1808. This supplied courtesy of Professor Rifaat Abou el-Hajj.
 24. Al-'Aṭṭār himself referred to "two stays": "I went there [Istanbul] twice . . . and I saw there books which exist nowhere else" (ibid., II, 150). On his stay with the Hakimbashi and his contact with European doctors, see idem, "Sharḥ al-'Aṭṭār al-musammā bi rāḥat al-abdān 'alā nuzhat al-adhḥān," which will be discussed in Chapter 9.
 25. Muḥammad al-'Aṭṭār, "Sharḥ al-'Aṭṭār 'alā manzūmat al-'Aṭṭār fī'l-tashrīḥ." Writing later than Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār, Muḥammad al-'Aṭṭār criticized the accuracy of Ibn Sīnā, in particular chap. 4 of *Al-Qānūn*, on bones (folio 8A0), but he does not abandon Ibn Sīnā (see folio 37A). It is interesting to read al-'Aṭṭār's marginal notes, written later to correct his earlier views. On the margin of this copy, he later inserted a comment by al-Qurashī (Ibn al-Nafīs), a writer who had not been known to him when he began, who was in disagreement with Ibn Sīnā (folio 6A).
 26. Al-'Aṭṭār, "Sharḥ al-'Aṭṭār al-musammā bi rāḥat al-abdān 'alā nuzhat al-adhḥān," folios 70–71.
 27. Ibid., folio 5. Muḥammad Tayyib Gokbilgin, "Hekim Bashi," *Encyclopedia of Islam*, 2d ed., III, 339–340; also known in Arabic as Ra'īs al-Aṭibba', he was a high medical functionary who appointed even foreign doctors. In the eighteenth century, it is claimed that his position was weakened by the Āghā of the Dār al-Sa'āda.
 28. Al-'Aṭṭār, "Sharḥ al-'Aṭṭār al-musammā bi rāḥat al-abdān 'alā nuzhat al-adhḥān," folio 163A. He also wrote that the majority of the doctors of his time were ignorant of the pulse because they did not meet with it in their training (folio 173B).
 29. T.-X. Bianchi, *Notice sur une ouvrage d'anatomie et de médecin*, p. 4.
 30. Al-'Aṭṭār, "Sharḥ al-'Aṭṭār al-musammā bi rāḥat al-abdān 'alā nuzhat al-adhḥān," folio 5A. This is not to be confused with two other *madrasas* in Damascus, al-Badriya (see Mubārak, *Al-Khitāt al-tawfiqiyya al-jadida*, IV, 38) or al-Badhrā'iyya (see al-Shaṭṭī, *Rawḍ al-bashar fī a'yān Dīnashq fī'l qarn al-thalīth 'ashar*, pp. 245, 257).
 31. Al-'Aṭṭār, "Ḥaṣhiyat al-'Aṭṭār 'alā sharḥ Muḥammad Efendi al-Bahnīsī," folio 97A (App. III, no. 37).
 32. Mubārak (*Al-Khitāt al-tawfiqiyya al-jadida*, IV, 39) appeared to have access to

some sources of precise information on these points. His claim that the Naqīb al-Ashraf was removed from power and then returned to his position is supported by al-‘Aṭṭār’s poetry (see *Al-Inshā*, pp. 71–73). The chief error in the account of Mubārak is the claim that he stayed extensively in Damascus on the way out of Egypt in 1802. Al-‘Aṭṭār stated (see *Hāshiyat al-‘Aṭṭār ‘alā sharḥ al-azharīya*, 1810/1225, folio 2) that he fled directly from Egypt to Turkey. What Mubārak reported of the Syrian period all came later. The quotation from the *Walādiyya* should be understood only in this sense, that is, “After my return to Damascus.”

33. Al-Jabartī, *‘Ajā’ib al-āthār fī’l-tarājim wa’l-akhbār*, III, 266, 276; IV, 51, 65; Henri Pérès, “L’Institut de l’Egypte et l’oeuvre de Bonaparte jugés par deux historiens Arabes contemporains,” *Arabica* 4 (1957): 113–130, esp. pp. 113–115; Mubārak, *Al-Khiṭaṭ al-tawfiqīya al-jadīda*, XV, 44–45.
34. Mubārak (*Al-Khiṭaṭ al-tawfiqīya al-jadīda*, IV, 39–40) included al-‘Aṭṭār’s poem on Damascus. He interjected a comment on some writings of his which are nowhere else referred to.
35. Al-Shaṭṭī, *Rawḍ al-bashar fī a’yān Dimashq fī’l-qam al-thālith ‘ashar*, pp. 223–224; Aḥmad Taymūr (ed.), *A’lām al-fikr al-islāmī fī’l-‘aṣr al-ḥadīth*, pp. 222–223.
36. Khayr al-dīn al-Ziriklī, *Al-A’lām*, III, 194; al-Shaṭṭī, *Rawḍ al-bashar fī a’yān Dimashq fī’l-qam al-thālith ‘ashar*, pp. 67–69; al-Bayṭār, *Ḥilyat al-bāshir fī tārikh al-qam al-thālith ‘ashar*, I, 463–474; II, 667. Other students who studied these subjects with al-‘Aṭṭār at the same time included ‘Abdullah al-Kurdi and Šāliḥ al-Zajjā.
37. Muḥammad al-‘Aṭṭār may have brought them together, since al-Yāfi knew Muḥammad al-‘Aṭṭār; al-Yāfi’s “Jawāb ‘alā su’āl min shaykh Muḥammad al-‘Aṭṭār,” *Al-‘Aṭṭār, Hāshiya ‘alā sharḥ alā jāmi’ al-jawāmi’*, II, 524; al-Ziriklī, *Al-A’lām*, X, 162. On al-Yāfi, who died in 1818/1233, see Kāhhālā, *Mu’jam al-mu’allifīn wa tarājim al-‘arabiya*, VII, 318; Brockelmann, *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur*, S2, p. 741; al-Shaṭṭī, *Rawḍ al-bashar fī a’yān Dimashq fī’l-qam al-thālith ‘ashar*, pp. 185–187.
38. On al-Ḥimṣī, see al-Bayṭār, *Ḥilyat al-bāshir fī tārikh al-qam al-thālith ‘ashar*, III, 1521–1525. On al-Mujtahid, see *ibid.*, II, 131–132; al-Shaṭṭī, *Rawḍ al-bashar fī a’yān Dimashq fī’l-qam al-thālith ‘ashar*, p. 187; or a work in praise of the Madāniya (a branch of the Shādhiliya) written by Ḥasan al-‘Aṭṭār. See Muḥammad Zāfir al-Madani, *Al-Nūr al-sāṭi’ wa’l-burhān al-qāṭi’*, p. 43.
39. Al-Bayṭār, *Ḥilyat al-bāshir fī tārikh al-qam al-thālith ‘ashar*, II, 716.
40. Al-‘Aṭṭār, *Hāshiya ‘alā sharḥ ‘alā jāmi’ al-jawāmi’*, II, 398, 405–406. His tone should be contrasted with that of his teacher, Muḥammad al-Amīr, who was also a student of Ibn al-‘Arabī, for example, on the feeling of separation from God according to Ibn al-‘Arabī (*al-Amīr, Hāshiyat al-Amīr ‘alā al-jawhara*, p. 102). Al-Amīr also quoted the *Futūḥāt makkīya*. Al-‘Aṭṭār was prepared to accept certain ideas even on the souls of plants and animals from him because these ideas did not deviate from a strict Sharī’a position.
41. Usāma ‘Anūṭi, *Al-Ḥarakat al-adabiya fī’l-Shām fī’l-qam al-thāmin ‘ashar*, pp. 150–151.
42. Al-Bayṭār, *Ḥilyat al-bāshir fī tārikh al-qam al-thālith ‘ashar*, I, 32; ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Khulāsī. See ‘Isā Iskandar al-Ma’lūf, *Al-Usra al-‘arabiya al-mushthara bi’l-tibb al-‘arabiya wa ash-hara al-makhtūṭāt al-tibbiya al-arabiya*, p. 19

43. By the eighteenth century Aleppo had a highly developed European community, with its own doctors. They were concerned with the plague and quarantine. Qasṭūn, *Al-Afrānj fī Ḥalab fī l-qam al-thāmin 'ashar*, p. 33 and passim, mentions its French surgeons.
44. Al-Ma'lūf, *Al-Uṣra al-'arabiya al-mushthara bi'l-ṭibb al-'arabiya wa ash-hara al-makhtūṭat al-ṭibbiya al-'arabiya*, p. 19. Until 1973 it was in the family library of the deceased author in Ba'labakk (or Zahlé), when it was allegedly sold.

6. The Muḥammad 'Alī Period, 1815–1837

1. Owen, *Cotton and the Egyptian Economy*, p. 20, mentions government financing of rice production and the Upper Egyptian sugar production. In 1816, a majority of crops grown in the Delta were likewise taken over. Muḥammad 'Alī made the sale of agricultural produce to merchants a crime.
2. Gabriel Baer, "Urbanization in Egypt, 1820–1907," in *The Beginnings of Modernization in the Middle East in the Nineteenth Century*, ed. W. R. Polk and R. L. Chambers, p. 158.
3. Guémard, *Une Oeuvre française*, pp. 102–103.
4. The Chamber had been formed in 1826 and was headed by Boghos Bey. Its structure reflected where power lay in the commercial sector. In Alexandria in 1826, the Chamber was composed of two Europeans and seven indigenous merchants; and in Cairo, of two Turks, three Egyptians, two Maghāribā, two Levantine Greeks, two Greek Schismatics, two Armenians, and two Jews. By 1836 the Greeks, especially in Alexandria, had registered a very considerable gain. The number of their houses rose from sixteen in 1822 to forty-four in 1836. In the secondary ports of Egypt, the Greeks began to dominate the scene (Politis, *L'Hellénisme et l'Égypte moderne*, I, 233, 239).
5. Abdel-Malek, *Idéologie et renaissance nationale de l'Égypte moderne*, p. 263, presents the contrary view; see, however, Rivlin, *Agricultural Policy of Muḥammad 'Alī*, pp. 174–176, which gives many references for the study of the depressed condition of the indigenous middle classes. Elsewhere, Rivlin stated that in 1831 a number of merchants were rounded up for conscription while at a fair (ibid., p. 203). The exception to this was the small group of wealthy merchants who were generally identified as being in the long-distance trade. This group had skills which Muḥammad 'Alī desired to incorporate into his bureaucracy.
6. Ra'uf 'Abbas Ḥamid, *Al-Niẓām al-ijtimā'ī fī Miṣr fī ḡill al-milkīya al-zirā'iya al-kabīra, 1837–1914*, esp. pp. 47, 56, 62. See his quotation from al-Taḥṭāwī (p. 29) to the effect that those Egyptians who oppose the policy of giving land to foreigners are stupid for not appreciating the beneficial role played by those foreigners. Al-Taḥṭāwī was one of the government's spokesmen.
7. It is clear that in Cairo the Maghāribā had separate *wakīls* for different regions within the Maghrib who were responsible to the Dīwān Khidwī (*Al-Waqā'i' al-Miṣriya*, no. 175 [July 3, 1830/14 Muharram 1246]).
8. Barker to Palmerston, Alexandria, July 20, 1833, British Foreign Office series 142, vol. 6.
9. Burckhardt, *Travels in Arabia*, pp. 15–16, 17, 38–39. No date is given on when Muḥammad 'Alī was "strong."

10. Walz, "The Trade between Egypt and Bilād As-Sudān," pp. 412ff, shows numerous regulations imposed by Muḥammad 'Alī of a fiscal nature, weakening the *wikāla*'s autonomy while at the same time permitting the entree of European merchants into the most profitable trade. The government took over for itself one lucrative commodity, slaves, yet another blow to merchant capital.
11. Afaf Marsot, "The Role of the 'Ulamā' in Egypt during the Early Nineteenth Century," in *Social Change in Modern Egypt*, ed. P. M. Holt, p. 278.
12. Al-'Aṭṭār, *Hāshiya 'alā sharḥ jāmi' al-jawāmi'*, II, 527, confirms this view. He stated that many 'ulamā' engaged in trade (this was written in 1830) while they should rather abstain and minimize their wants. He cited the book of Raghib Pasha, defending trade (*Dharī'at al-takassub*), but he also stated that he felt the Ṣūfīs were exploiting the people, taking from them, and that God obliged man to earn a living.
13. Dār al-Wathā'iq, Daftar al-Awāmir, no. 11, p. 11, item 65. Courtesy Professor Afaf Marsot.
14. Marsot, "The Role of the 'Ulamā' through the Nineteenth Century," conference paper, American University in Cairo–Columbia University Conference, 1968. Unpaginated original located in the Center for Arabic Studies Library of the American University in Cairo. Here the author was able to make use of the Bakrī family papers. Her interpretation was that al-Azhar in the time of al-Bājūrī regained some of its previous autonomy.
15. Heyworth-Dunne, *History of Education in Modern Egypt*, pp. 133–134, 150, 160, 333. Henri Rusi, the son of a tannery owner in Rosetta, played an important role in the new bureaucracy.
16. Ibrahim Salama, *Bibliographie analytique et critique*, p. 110, cited an event in 1830 in which Muḥammad 'Alī dedicated the library of *kuttāb* to "the spirit of the Prophet and his companions, and of the jurisconsults of Islam and of Shāh Muḥammad Bahā' al-dīn al-Naqshbandī . . ." In another case, Muḥammad 'Alī was reported to wish his son Sa'īd Bey to be in science like Sa'd al-dīn al-Taftāzānī and in morality like Muḥṭy al-dīn b. al-'Arabī (ibid., p. 91).
17. Lane, *Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, pp. 218–219; Baer, "Social Change in Egypt," p. 147; *Al-Waqa'd'i' al-Miṣrīya* (January 10, 1831/15 Ṣafar 1246) reports a complaint from rural people (*aḥālī al-aqālīm*) that Muḥammad 'Alī was confiscating food sent to the students at al-Azhar if this exceeded a certain amount.
18. Salama, *Bibliographie analytique et critique*, pp. 98–100. The willingness of the Qādī to receive bribes should not be discounted; it is an indication of disenfranchised power. Lane, *Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, pp. 115–118; al-'Aṭṭār, *Hāshiya al-'Aṭṭār 'alā sharḥ jāmi' al-jawāmi'*, II, 187. Al-'Aṭṭār stated that *rashwa* (bribery) was becoming a commonplace; this was written in 1830.
19. A. Le Chatelier, *Les Confréries musulmanes du Hedjaz*, pp. 3–4 and passim; Shaw, *Ottoman Egypt*, pp. 103–104. But in one case, that of the Sānūsīya, who were critics of Muḥammad 'Alī (see Chapter 7), their representative, Ibrāhīm al-Rashidī, was rejected by al-Azhar, presumably those *zāwīyas* opened in Egypt were not effectively administered by the government (Le Chatelier, *Les Confréries musulmanes du Hedjaz*).
20. Le Chatelier, *Les Confréries musulmanes du Hedjaz*, p. 521 and passim; Octave Depont and X. Capolani, *Les Confréries religieuses musulmanes*, pp. 378–382, for North Africa; John Spencer Trimingham, *Sufi Orders in Islam*, pp. 79–80.

More recently, on the Tijāniya and their contacts through Ḥājī 'Umar with Khalwatīs of al-Azhar, see Martin, "Notes sur l'origine de la ṭarīqa des Tijāniya et sur le début d'al-Ḥājī 'Umar," p. 282.

21. Movement of Aḥmad Idrīs in 1824; cf. Arthur Robinson, "The Conquest of the Sudan by the Wālī of Egypt, Muḥammad 'Alī Pasha," *Journal of the African Society* (1926): 49–50.
22. In the absence of archival studies of institutions, the evidence of continuity is literary:

1. Hasan al-'Aṭṭār. In the later writings of Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār, there are continuing references to the Safavid scientist, poet, and mystic Bahā' al-dīn al-'Āmilī, so important to the Wafā'iya. In a work written in 1814, he doubted the veracity of an astrological tale which al-'Āmilī had recounted ("Sharḥ al-'Aṭṭār al-musammā bi rāḥat al-abdān 'alā nuzhat al-adhḥān," folio 28). In a later work written about 1822, al-'Aṭṭār referred in a discussion of architectural problems to a problem raised in al-'Āmilī's *Al-Kashkūl* about a piece of land containing a tree of unknown height ("Ḥāshīya 'alā sharḥ ta'sīs al-ashkal," folio 99A). In his *Al-Inshā'*, written in the early 1820's, al-'Aṭṭār included a model of a letter to be addressed to a Ṣūfī *shaykh* drawn from *Al-Kashkūl*. Elsewhere in the section on letters of praise, a range of expressions are used which were familiar in Wafā'iya circles in the praises of Abī Anwār al-Sādāt, for example, "apex of his age" (*dhurwat ṭūrihi*), "the source of its light" (*majal nūrihi*), "and its visibility" (*wa zuḥūrihi*), etc. (*Al-Inshā'*, pp. 84–87). In a work which was finished in 1830, al-'Aṭṭār again drew on the traditions of the Wafā'iya in his explanation of unity of witness, *waḥdat al-shuhūd*, citing 'Alī b. Wafā' (*Ḥāshīya 'alā sharḥ iḍmī' al-jawāmi'*, II, 517–518); for other poetry by him see pp. 453, 358.

2. Al-Ṭaḥṭāwī, al-'Aṭṭār's most famous student, was initiated into the Wafā'iya and given the name Abū'l-'Azīm by Abī Anwār. He subsequently wrote two works on mysticism, one of which was on the theme of Ahl al-Bayt, and the second a commentary on a mystical poem. He also taught *ḥadīth* and, as his biographer pointed out, he taught it analytically as al-Zabīdī had done. See Ṣāliḥ al-Majdī, *Ḥilyat al-zamān bi manāqib khādim al-waṭan, sirat Rifā'a Rafī'i al-Ṭaḥṭāwī*, pp. 17, 18, 28, 29.

3. Muḥammad Shihāb al-dīn, al-'Aṭṭār's protegee in the *Waqā'i' al-Miṣriya*, wrote many poems praising Muḥammad Abī Anwār and his successor, Sayyid Aḥmad (*Dirwān Muḥammad Shihāb al-dīn*, pp. 115–116, 138, and passim).

4. Ibrāhīm al-Saqqā', a student of literature of al-'Aṭṭār, was a poet and employee in various government positions. As a teacher in the government school (Madrasa Amīriya), he was singled out in Wafā'i sources as the teacher of the son of the Shaykh al-Sijāda (al-Bakrī, *Bayt al-Sādāt*, p. 9). He was also a continuator of eighteenth-century studies in *ḥadīth*, writing two works on history. One was on the theme of Ahl al-Bayt, "Al-Ruwḥād al-nadīr fī mā yata'alliq bi'l-bayt al-bashīr al-nadhīr" (*Dār al-Kutub*, 430 Majāmi', folios 33–41), and the other is on the subject of the wives of the Prophet, "Risālat al-Saqqā'" (al-Azhar, 2163 Tārīkh). Muḥammad 'Iyād al-Ṭaṭṭāwī also studied literature with al-'Aṭṭār. He wrote "Ḥāshiyat al-Ṭaṭṭāwī 'alā sharḥ al-Saqqā' 'alā manzūmat al-Sayyid Muḥammad Bulīḥa al-musammā bi dhalika al-sharḥ bi'l-tuḥfa al-saniya fī'l-'aqa'id al-sunniya." See Aḥmad Taymūr, "Al-Shaykh Muḥammad 'Iyād al-Ṭaṭṭāwī," *Majallat al-Majma' al-'Ilmi al-'Arabi* 4

(1924): 387–391, esp. p. 388. Whether or not al-Ṭanṭāwī was formally a Ṣūfī has not been determined.

5. Abū Wafā' Naṣr al-Ḥūrīnī, an editor in the Amīriya Press, was known for his works in the science of language and for his studies on *ḥadīth*. Both he and his son were Ṣūfis. See 'Umar Ṭūsūn, *Al-Ba'thāt al-'ilmīya fī 'aḥd Muḥammad 'Alī*, pp. 174, 346.

23. Lane, *Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, p. 522.
24. Al-Bakrī, *Bayt al-Ṣiddīq*, p. 41 and passim. This was in the period in which many glosses appeared on the text *Mawlid al-Muṣṭafa*, for example, that of Ibrāhīm al-Bājūrī, Ḥasan al-Abṭāḥ, Aḥmad Faṣṣarah, and Muḥammad b. 'Uthmān al-Dim'yāṭī (listed under history and *ḥadīth* in the Dār al-Kutub MSS catalogue). See also by Muḥammad 'Alī al-Jirjāwī, Muḥammad al-Amīr al-Ṣaghrī, 'Alī b. 'Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Ḥujjājī al-Mālikī, etc. Clearly this related to the needs of the period. Lane, *Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, p. 473, describes al-Bakrī's carrying out these responsibilities. These studies are of course written in the tradition of eighteenth-century *ḥadīth* studies.
25. Abdel-Malek, *Idéologie et renaissance nationale de l'Égypte moderne*, pp. 28–30; Lane, *Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, pp. 127–128; Rivlin, *Agricultural Policy of Muḥammad 'Alī*, p. 191.
26. N. Tomiche, "La Situation des artisans et petit commerçants en l'Égypte de la fin du XVIII^{ème} siècle jusqu'au milieu du XIX^{ème}," *Studia Islamica* 12 (1960): 79–94. The parallel to Turkey in Chapter 5 is probably more apt.
27. Lane, *Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, p. 202; Guémard, *Une Oeuvre française*.
28. Rivlin, *Agricultural Policy of Muḥammad 'Alī in Egypt*, p. 201.
29. Trimingham, *Sufi Orders in Islam*, pp. 79–80. Perhaps the split came when the son of 'Alī al-Bayyūmī, Muḥammad, joined the Khalwatīya. See Isma'īl 'Abdullah al-Maghribī, *Kitāb nūr al-waḍ' fī manāqib wa karāmāt 'umdat al-awlīya*, pp. 157–158; a doctor named Muḥammad Nāfi' is mentioned in al-Shayyāl, *Tārīkh al-tarjama wa'l-ḥarakat al-thaqāfiya fī 'aṣr Muḥammad 'Alī*, p. 102. If this were the same man, it would suggest that the order had a new class orientation. Another eighteenth-century lower-class order retained an attenuated existence during the Muḥammad 'Alī period. This was the 'Isawīya, whose members continued to be nearly all Maghāribā. They held irregular *dhikrs*. Among the main figures was Ḥājī Muḥammad al-Salāwī, former lamp lighter in the Mawlid of al-Ḥasanayn. He was renowned as a famous fire and glass eater. Lane observed a *dhikr* and stated that "there was no regularity in their dancing, but each seemed to be performing the antics of a madman; now moving his body up and down, then using strange gesticulations with his arms, next jumping, and sometimes screaming . . ." (Lane, *Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, pp. 465–466).
30. Mubārak, *Al-Khitāt al-tawfiqiya al-jadīda*, IV, 40.
31. Al-Kattānī, *Fihris al-fahāris wa aṭḥbāt wa mu'jam al-ma'ājim wa'l-mashīkhāt wa'l-musalsalāt*, I, 163–164. He is probably the person known as Sīdī al-Makki, of Maghribī origin.
32. Al-Shaṭṭī, *Rawd al-bashar fī 'yān Dimashq fī'l-qarn al-thālith 'aṣhar*, p. 197. See also p. 205 for his biography of his teacher Muḥammad al-Ayyūbī al-Rahmānī.
33. Al-Bayṭār, *Hilyat al-bāshir fī tārīkh al-qarn al-thālith 'aṣhar*, I, 535

34. Al-Kattānī, *Fihris al-fahāris wa athbāt wa mu'jam al-ma'ajim wa'l-mashikhāt wa'l-musalsalat*, II, 454–457.
35. For his Andalusian influence on al-Ṭanṭāwī, cf. Ignatius Kratchkowski, *Hayat Muḥammad 'Iyād al-Ṭanṭāwī*, p. 145; on Shihāb al-Dīn, cf. Abdel-Malek, *Idéologie et renaissance nationale de l'Égypte moderne*, pp. 302–303, and Taymūr, *A' lām al-fikr al-islāmī fī'l-'aṣr al-ḥadīth*, pp. 342–346; on Yūsuf Badr al-Dīn al-Murrākshī, cf. al-Shaṭṭī, *Rawḍ al-bashar fī a'yān Dimashq fī'l-qam al-thālith 'ashar*, pp. 262–264.
36. Abū 'l-Qāsim al-Zayyātī, *Al-Turjamāna al-kubrā*, p. 561; 'Abd al-Salām b. Su'ūd, *Dalīl mu'arrikh al-Maghrib al-aqṣā*, p. 331, entry 1424. The book of Ibn al-Khaṭīb has already been mentioned as arousing the enmity of Egyptian litterateurs! Thanks to Ms. Evelyn Early for conducting an interview for me with a very learned scholar of Fez, Morocco, Shaykh 'Abd al-Qādir al-Zammāma. I would also like to thank Shaykh al-Zammāma for his subsequent help (in 1971–72) through a series of letters in which he gave me what information could be found on this subject.
37. Al-'Aṭṭār, *Al-Inshā'*, pp. 48–49.
38. Ibid., pp. 62–66; idem, *Hashiya 'alā sharḥ al-Khabīṣī*, pp. 2–3 [App. III, no. 32].
39. Al-'Aṭṭār's exchange of letters with the court litterateur of Muḥammad 'Alī, Khayret Efendi, is preserved. Khayret Efendi's *Inshā'* was called *Riyāḍ al-kutabā' wa ḥiyāḍ al-udabā'* (Cairo: Bulāq, 1875/1292); al-'Aṭṭār, *Al-Inshā'*, pp. 61–62; Aziz Efendi, *Inshā'* (Alexandria, 1832/1249), not located.
40. By Marā'ī al Muqaddisī al-Ḥanbalī (Cairo: Dār al-Kutub 34 al-Adab).
41. One of his students wrote a criticism of his *Inshā'*: Ḥasan al-Quwaydār, "Zuhūr al-nabāt fī'l-inshā' wa'l-murāsālāt" (unlocated manuscript, mentioned by Muḥammad 'Abd al-Ghanī Ḥasan, *Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār*, p. 27).
42. Al-'Aṭṭār, *Al-Inshā'*, pp. 56–58; al-Baghdādī, *Hidāyat al-'ārifin asma' al-mu'allifin athār al-muṣannifin*, I, 188; F. Abdullah, "Arif Hikmet Bey," *Encyclopedia of Islam*, 2d ed., I, 564–568. The latter source states that Arif's brother was Ataullah Efendi, whom al-'Aṭṭār apparently had met in Istanbul (however, the same source states that this was denied by Cevdet Pasha). On Arif's library, which he gave to Madīna, see the catalog called "Fihris kutub-khānat Arif Hikmet Bek bi'l-Madīna al-munawwara wa Miṣr; Fihris kutub-khānat al-Sultān Maḥmūd bi'l-Madīna ayyadan," compiled by an unknown hand in 1879/1297 (Dār al-Kutub, Cairo, 36 'ilm al-maktabāt). For a list of books which he studied with al-'Aṭṭār, see Shaykh Aḥmad b. 'Abdullah al-Yās, who wrote an *ijāza* for him in 1820/1236 (Dār al-Kutub, Cairo, 230, *ijāza*, Tal'at). Among other reformers with whom he was in active contact was the Tunisian Ibn Abī al-Diyāf, cf. Abdesselem, *Les Historiens tunisiens*, p. 113.
43. For the principal biography of Sami Bey, see Dény, "Quatre lettres de Mehmet Ali de l'Égypte," in *Mélanges offerts à Wm. Marçais*, pp. 125–146, esp. pp. 140–146; Claude Henri Saint-Simon and Enfantin, *Oeuvres de Saint-Simon et d'Enfantin*, vol. 28, correspondence dated June 12, 1834, from Enfantin to Lambert, *Al-Waqā'i' al-Miṣriya*, for example, no. 40 (July 30, 1829/23 Muḥarram 1245); no. 202 (October 23, 1836/7 Jumādā al-Ulā 1246); no. 388 (June 3, 1832/3 Muḥarram 1248).
44. An editorial in *Al-Waqā'i' al-Miṣriya* on *al-hikma* and 'Abd al-Qādir al-Kilānī (al-Jilānī?) argues for the distinction between *al-hikma* of this world and divine *hikma*. This article appeared in both the Turkish and the Arabic versions at the time of Sami Bey [*Al-Waqā'i' al-Miṣriya*, no. 37 (May 13, 1829/8 Dhu'l-

- Qa'da 1244]). In another essay, Sami praised *al-ḥikma* and the study of it, referring to the Sūfism of his youth and to his studies in calligraphy (ibid., no. 43 [June 3, 1829/end of Dhū'l-Qa'da 1244]).
45. The studies of the newspaper never consider its intellectual basis. They make the Arabic and Turkish versions seem water-tight language compartments. See Reinaud, "De la gazette arabe et turque imprimée en l'Égypte," *Journal Asiatique* 1st ser., 8 (1831): 240. Reinaud states that the Arabic version followed the Turkish version, which was more detailed. Abūl-Futūḥ al-Riḍwān, *Tārīkh maṭba'at Bulāq*, p. 269, states that al-'Aṭṭār, Fāris Shidyāq, and Shihāb al-dīn were the first group of Arabic editors of the Arabic "copy" (!) of the paper. Ibrāhīm 'Abduh, *Tārīkh al-Waqā'i' al-Miṣrīya*, pp. 33–34, doubts if there were a separate section before Shihāb al-Dīn and claims that he found no documents to support such a claim. This may well be correct in that the group may have been very closely knit in the beginning.
 46. Al-'Aṭṭār, *al-Inshā'*, p. 3.
 47. Laverne Kuhnke, "Resistance and Response to Modernization: Preventive Medicine and Social Control in Egypt, 1825–1850" (doctoral dissertation), p. 115.
 48. *Al-Waqā'i' al-Miṣrīya*, no. 47 (August 29, 1829); no. 186 (April 4, 1831/20 Shawwāl 1246); Mubārak, *Al-Khiṭaṭ al-tawfīqiya al-jadida*, IV, 40.
 49. An administrative case involving Shaykh al-Azhar and two Bedouin *shaykhs* is discussed in *Al-Waqā'i' al-Miṣrīya*, no. 534 (July 3, 1833/23 Ṣafar 1249); another case, involving inheritance and criminal activity, in ibid., no. 319 (November 23, 1831/16 Jumādā al-Akhira 1247); administration in a criminal case, ibid., no. 323 (December 3, 1831/26 Jumādā al-Akhira 1247). All the work on the Muhammad 'Alī period since J. Dény, *Le Sommaire des archives turques au Caire*, has mentioned the consultative assemblies in which the Shaykh al-Azhar participated, but on the whole little of it is very substantive. Dodwell, *Founder of Modern Egypt*, p. 205, discusses the higher council formed in 1834 to deal with matters regarding the Sharī'a and trade! Lane, *Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, pp. 121–122.
 50. Ḥasan, *Hasan al-'Aṭṭār*, p. 40; Lane, *Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, pp. 299–300. Lane reported that when al-Quwaysnī became Shaykh al-Riwaq of the blind, his first act was to have all the members of the *riwāq* flogged. But they retaliated by flogging him and forced him to leave the office (ibid., pp. 217–218). A poet quoted by Mubārak makes the interesting point that al-Quwaysnī kept his Sūfī affiliation secret (*Al-Khiṭaṭ al-tawfīqiya al-jadida*, XIV, 141–142) and that he adhered to the Sharī'a in public, that is, in the Azhar. Finally, despite the various works in logic which al-Quwaysnī cites, one can judge from his intellectual autobiography that he was much more a product of the *ḥadīth* movement of the eighteenth century than a student of the rational sciences. See his "Sanad al-Quwaysnī" (Dār al-Kutub, Cairo, 23126B), in which he mentions his work on the *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* with Muḥammad al-Ḥifnī and 'Abdullah al-Sharqāwī.
 51. *Al-Waqā'i' al-Miṣrīya*, no. 378 (May 1, 1832/end of Dhū'l-Qa'da 1247); another case involved an apparent struggle between al-'Aṭṭār and a proofreader of medical books, Shaykh Muḥammad al-Ḥarāwī. The latter opposed al-'Aṭṭār's choice of proofreaders for the Abū Za'bal Medical School (ibid., no. 408 [July 24, 1832/25 Ṣafar 1248]). See Ahmad 'Izzat 'Abd al-Karīm, *Tārīkh al-ta'lim fi 'asr Muḥammad 'Alī*, pp. 258, 289, 290, also al-Shayyāl, *Tārīkh al-tarjama wa l-harakat al-thaqāfiya fi 'asr Muḥammad 'Alī*, pp. 175–177.

52. Al-Husaynī, "Sharḥ al-umm al-musammā bi murshid al-anām li birr umm al-imām," p. 40; al-Quwaysnī (Ḥasan Ibn Darwīsh) wrote at least two works on logic, and on one, his commentary on the *Sullam*, a gloss was written by Muṣṭafā al-Būlāqī (Dār al-Kutub, Cairo, 120 Mantīq, Taymūr). Al-Quwaysnī had a second work on the same text of al-Akhḍarī called "Mukhtaṣar sharḥ sullam" (Al-Azhar, Cairo, 34253 Ḥalīm 820).
53. Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm, known as Ibn al-Ḥanbalī (died 976), "Durr al-ḥubb fi tārikh a'yan Ḥalab" (Sūhā, Egypt, Maktaba Baladiya 60 Tārikh), II, folio 2, contains the *hāmish* (marginal note) of Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār. The bulk of this library consists of the library of al-Tahtāwī. I wish to thank Professor Ḥasan al-Ḥabashī of 'Ayn Shams University, Department of History, who gave me this completely unknown source. The exact death date of al-'Aṭṭār is not known. Muḥammad 'Alī appointed his successor on February 18, 1835/19 Shawwāl 1250 (Amīn Sāmī, *Taqwīm al-Nil*, II, 424).
54. [Dr.] P. N. Hamont, *L'Egypte sous Mehmet Ali*, II, 90–91, mentioned al-'Aṭṭār's support of anatomical dissection (discussed in full in the section on medicine in Chapter 8) and stated that al-'Aṭṭār advocated the teaching of hygiene, i.e., preventive medicine (ibid., II, 392–393). Al-'Aṭṭār had, in fact, since the 1820's supported Hamont's idea of founding a school of veterinary medicine. See Heyworth-Dunne, *History of Education in Modern Egypt*, p. 82.
55. Clot Bey, *Mémoires de Clot Bey*, pp. 130–131 [App. III, no. 88]. One should note that al-'Aṭṭār singled out for special praise his students, the correctors.
56. Lane, *Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, pp. 196–197. Lane was under the impression that al-Quwaysnī was the most famous *shaykh* in Egypt.

7. The Revival of Theology and Kalām

1. Abū al-Thana' Shihāb al-dīn Maḥmūd al-Alūsī, "Al-Ṣādiḥ bi shahīq al-nujūm 'alā afnān tarjamat Shaykh al-Islām wa Walī al-Ni'am," folio 25 and passim, for a full list.
2. Ibid., e.g., the *Faṭḥ al-mubdī bi sharḥ mukhtaṣar al-Zabīdī* . . . (a work on *ḥadīth* which has been previously cited); "Ḥāshiyat al-Sharqāwī 'alā sharḥ Hudhūdā 'alā umm burhān al-Sānūsī" (*fīqh*).
3. Al-Bayṭār, *Ḥilyat al-bāshir fī tārikh al-qam al-thālith 'ashar*, II, 489–492, from an *ijāza* of al-'Aṭṭār to a Syrian student around 1815. The student studied religious subjects with him (Ḥasan al-Bayṭār). Only al-Alūsī gives a list of works which al-'Aṭṭār taught (see above), and he listed only the texts taught to the Qāḍī Arif Hikmet Bey.
4. Pīr Birkāwī (Birghili Mehmet Efendi), died 1573/981, author of "Al-Tarīqa al-muḥammadiya," was a Bayrāmī Ṣūfī and a zealous preacher of the *sunna*.
5. Article on the Tarīqa Muḥammadiya forthcoming.
6. Al-'Aṭṭār, *Ḥāshiya 'alā sharḥ jāmi' al-jawāmi'*, II, 523–524. Al-'Aṭṭār's sources on *al-jabrīya* included Shāh Walī ullah al-Naqshbandī's *Hujjat allah al-baligha* (ibid., II, 454). This being a later work, it relied on Māturīdite sources, as well.
7. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo, 1171 'Ilm al-kalām.
8. This was written in 1813/1228; sometimes called "Risālat al-'Aṭṭār fī 'ilm al-kalām" (App. III, no 9). Another way of dating this piece is through his opening line. Al-'Aṭṭār began this essay with a virtual paraphrase of the wording of Ibn

- al-‘Arabī in the opening of *Al-futūḥāt al-makkiyya*: “Subḥāna man awjada al-ashiya” bi qudratihi min al-‘adam ilā al-wujūd.” He was, of course, reading Ibn al-‘Arabī in this period (see below, under the discussion on mysticism).
9. Al-‘Aṭṭār, “*Ḥadḥā jawāb al-‘Aṭṭār ‘an su’āl jā ‘alayhi min al-Shaykh al-Thu’aylib*,” 1815/1230, folio 2A (App. III, no. 11), citing Sayyid al-Jurjānī, “*Hāshiya ‘alā sharḥ ḥikmat al-‘ayn*.” On folio 7 he cited the views of Fakhr al-dīn al-Rāzī.
 10. Al-‘Aṭṭār, “*Hāshiyat al-‘Aṭṭār ‘alā sharḥ ta’wīl al-ashkāl*,” folios 76–77.
 11. F. E. Peters, *Aristotle and the Arabs*, pp. 203–207. Al-Ījī was known for his book, the *Mawāqif fī ilm al-kalām*, for which the most famous commentary was that by al-Jurjānī.
 12. Mubārak, *Al-Khiṭaṭ al-tawfiqiyya al-jadīda*, IV, 40. But in the late eighteenth century, al-Sayyid al-Balidī taught Aḥmad al-‘Arūsī the *Tafsīr of al-Bayḍawī* in the Ashrafiyya madrasa (Bayṭar, *Hilyat al-bāshir fī tārīkh al-qarn al-thālith ‘ashar*, I, 171). Aḥmad al-Dardīr wrote a commentary on an essay on al-Bayḍawī written by Turkish Qāḍī and dated 1782/1197.
 13. For the section on impurity see his comments on the “*Sharḥ al-Badikhshī on al-Bayḍawī*” (al-‘Aṭṭār, *Hāshiya ‘alā sharḥ jāmi‘ al-jawāmi‘*, II, 33).
 14. Al-‘Aṭṭār, *Hāshiya ‘alā sharḥ jāmi‘ al-jawāmi‘*, II, 197, 200. Al-‘Aṭṭār relied on the *Muqaddima* of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, a text on “*ilm muṣṭalah al-ḥadīth*.” His familiarity with this author can be traced back to his Damascus period when he wrote a gloss on *Nukhba fī ‘uṣūl al-ḥadīth* (App. III, no. 3).
 15. Al-‘Aṭṭār, *Hāshiya ‘alā sharḥ jāmi‘ al-jawāmi‘*, II, 200. Al-‘Aṭṭār may have received a certain amount of criticism of the *ṣaḥāba* from his Khalwati teachers, who did not concentrate on them to the same degree as the Wafā’iyya (al-Sharqawī, *Fatḥ al-mubdī bi sharḥ mukhtaṣar al-Zabīdī*, III, 71).
 16. Forthcoming article on *ijtihād* will attempt to examine, with some new material, the conception of the closing of the gates of *ijtihād*.
 17. Da’ūd Rahbar, “*Shāh Walī’ullah and Ijtihād: A Translation of Selected Passages from his ‘Iqd al-Jid fī Ahkām al-Ijtihād wa’l-Taqlīd*,” *Muslim World* 45 (1955): 348.
 18. Al-Kattānī, *Fihris al-fahāris wa āthbāt wa mu’jam al-ma’ajim wa’l-mashīkhāt wa’l-musalsalāt*, II, 374–381.
 19. It can be estimated that al-‘Aṭṭār and al-Sānūsī met in Cairo between 1830 and 1832. Al-‘Aṭṭār died in 1835/1250. A signed manuscript by the Muftī reads “*Risāla li’l-‘allāma Muṣṭafā al-Bulāqī fī’l-ḥukm ‘alā al-Shaykh al-Sānūsī wa ṭarīqatihi*,” 1847/1264.
 20. Muḥammad al-Sānūsī, *Shifa’ al-ṣadr bi āra’ al-masā’il al-‘ashar*, pp. 3–4.
 21. Nicola A. Ziadeh, *Sanūsīya: A Study of the Revivalist Movement in Islam*, p. 81.
 22. Muṣṭafā al-Bulāqī was a muftī of the Mālikīs. He was a Khalwati Ṣūfī who entered the *ṭarīqa* under the tutelage of a Khalifa of Aḥmad al-Dardīr named Ṣalīḥ al-Sibā’ī. He studied the rational sciences and, like Ḥasan al-‘Aṭṭār, became interested in modern natural sciences. He was a close friend of some of the first Egyptian technocrats, such as Maḥmūd Bey al-Fālākī and Salāma Pasha. He even composed essays on mathematics and the use of instruments in the natural sciences (Mubārak, *Al-Khiṭaṭ al-tawfiqiyya al-jadīda*, IX, 33–34; Ziadeh, *Sanūsīya*, p. 38).
 23. Ziadeh, *Sanūsīya*, pp. 43–44.
 24. Al-‘Aṭṭār, “*Risālat al-‘Aṭṭār fī’l-ijtihād wa’l-taqlīd*,” no composition date given (App. III, no. 13).
 25. Al Zabīdī, who opposed the use of *ra’y* and *qiyāṣ*, stood in the background. For a

- view of *ijtihād* based on *ḥadīth*, see “‘Uqūd al-jawāhir fī adilla madhhab al-Imām Abū Ḥanīfa,” I, 14; also his *Taj al-‘arūs min sharḥ jawāhir al-qāmūs*, II, 330, where he limits *ijtihād* to Qur’ān and *sunna*, somewhat as al-Sanūsī did.
26. Al-Amīr, *Hāshiya ‘alā sharḥ ‘Abd al-Salām ‘alā al-jawhara*, pp. 37, 86.
27. Muḥammad Fū‘ad Shukrī, *Al-Sanūsīya, dīn wa dawla*, showed that al-Sanūsī was exceedingly energetic in the pursuit of knowledge and traveled widely in order to obtain it.
28. The main source al-‘Aṭṭār cited in this work was a Mālikī work by Shihāb al-dīn Ibn al-‘Abbās Aḥmad b. Idrīs al-Ma‘rūf bi’l-Qarāfi al-Mālikī, died 684. This work is called “Sharḥ tanqīḥ al-fuṣūl fī’l-uṣūl.” Al-‘Aṭṭār’s choice of a Cairo Mālikī *faqīh* was obviously a part of the polemic.
29. *Rawḍat al-madāris al-miṣriyya* I, no. 7 (1865/1282): 7–24 (App. III, no. 82). Al-‘Aṭṭār mentioned another student of *uṣūl al-fiqh* named Burhān al-dīn (unidentified) (*Hāshiyat ‘alā sharḥ jāmi‘ al-jawāmi‘*, I, 268).
30. *Rawḍat al-madāris al-miṣriyya*, p. 25. His source in this essay was a work entitled “Al-Iqtisād fī marātib al-ijtihād,” by Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Raḥman al-Bakrī al-Ṣiddīqī.
31. Cyril Elgood, “Medicine of the Prophet,” *Osiris* 14 (1962): 50.
32. H. Laoust, *Contribution à une étude de la methodologie canonique de Taqī al-dīn Aḥmad b. Taymīya*, pp. 16–23. Al-‘Aṭṭār followed the two-qills theory of the Shāfi‘īs. The same dispute or a similar one involved other Maghāriba in Cairo, as was noted in the case of Muḥammad al-Amīr.
33. Ziadeh, *Sanūsīya*, pp. 43–44. Al-‘Aṭṭār’s essay dealt with points which al-Bulāqī did not treat, a *takmilā* on al-Bulāqī’s attack?
34. Al-‘Aṭṭār, *Hāshiya ‘alā sharḥ jāmi‘ al-jawāmi‘*, II, 513–515.
35. Al-‘Aṭṭār, “Nubdha yastra fī ba‘d mā yata‘alliq bi’l-basmala wa’l-ḥamd,” folio 8B; standard title is “Risāla fī’l-basmala wa’l-ḥamdala.” Here he opposed Ibn al-‘Arabī and preferred the Muḥaqqiqīn, such as Sa’d al-dīn al-Taftazānī.
36. Nicholas Rescher, *The Development of Arabic Logic*, pp. 46–47, 77–78.
37. Al-Ṣabbān, *Hāshiyat al-Ṣabbān ‘alā Mallāwī (al-sharḥ al-ṣaḡīr) ‘alā al-sullam al-muraunaq li’l-Akhḍarī*, pp. 143–144; written 1766/1180. See also Aḥmad al-Damanhūrī, “Iyḍāḥ al-mubham min ma‘āni al-sullam.”
38. See bibliography of al-‘Aṭṭār’s writings, Appendix III.
39. ‘Alī Sāmī al-Nashshār, *Manāhij al-baḥṭh ‘inda mufakkirī al-Islām wa naqd al-Muslimīn li’l-mantiq al-Aristū*, p. 21, and Ibrahim Madkour, *L’Organon d’Aristote dans le monde arabe*, p. 248 and passim, give a critique of al-‘Aṭṭār from the perspective of classical logic. Al-‘Aṭṭār was the student of Muḥammad al-Disūqī, an ‘*alim*’ who, like al-‘Aṭṭār, had traveled abroad to study science and returned to be a *faqīh*. Al-Jabartī, *‘Ajā’ib al-āthār fī’l-tarājim al-akhbār*, IV, 232; al-‘Aṭṭār, *Hāshiya ‘alā sharḥ jāmi‘ al-jawāmi‘*, I, 2.
40. For al-Bihārī, see Brockelmann, *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur*, S2, p. 622. He was known as a *faqīh*, an *uṣūlī*, and a logician.
41. Al-‘Aṭṭār, *Hāshiya ‘alā sharḥ al-Khabīṣī*, p. 220. For Bahr al-‘ulūm, see Muḥammad Shāfi‘ī, *Encyclopedia of Islam*, 2d ed., I, 936–937; see Jamāl al-dīn al-Afghānī, “Hāshiyat al-Afghānī ‘alā sharḥ al-Lakhnāwī ‘alā sullam al-‘ulūm li Muhibbullah al-Bihārī,” 1875/1292.
42. Brockelmann, *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur*, S2, pp. 622, 624. Brockelmann does not list any glosses on it in Turkey or the Arab world.
43. ‘Abd al-Ḥā‘ī Fakhr al-dīn al-Hasanī, *Nuḥat al-khawātir wa bahjat al-ma‘āmi‘ wa’l-nawāzīr*, VI, 250–252.

44. Rescher, *Development of Arabic Logic*, p. 197; Madkour, *L'Organon d'Aristote dans le monde arabe*, pp. 32–33. Edwin Calverley, "Al-Abhari's *Isāghūjī fī'l-Mantiq*," in *MacDonald Presentation Volume* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1933), pp. 75–85; Brockelmann, "Al-Abhari," *Encyclopedia of Islam*, 2d ed., I, 98–99; Peters, *Aristotle and the Arabs*, pp. 79–87.
45. Abbé Toderini, *De la littérature des Turcs*, I, 70.
46. Rescher, *Development of Arabic Logic*, pp. 233–234.
47. Al-'Aṭṭār, *Ḥāshiyā 'alā sharḥ al-Isāghūjī*, pp. 24, 40, 46 (App. III, no. 30).
48. Al-Ḥifnāwī, *Ḥāshiyat al-Ḥifnāwī 'alā sharḥ 'alā al-Isāghūjī*, dated 1757/1171.
49. Al-'Aṭṭār, *Ḥāshiyā 'alā sharḥ 'alā al-Isāghūjī*, pp. 2–3.
50. Al-'Aṭṭār, *Ḥāshiyā 'alā sharḥ al-Khabṭī 'alā al-tahdhīb*, pp. 18–19, 21. Concerning the work of Mīr Zāhid, he said that it mentioned everything one could wish in the course of the author's investigation. Al-'Aṭṭār then went so far as to lament the lack of contact with the 'ulamā' of India, whom he contrasted favorably with those of Egypt (ibid., p. 120). Elsewhere, he affirmed the absolute superiority of Indian 'ulamā' in logic over the Azharis (*Ḥāshiyā 'alā sharḥ jāmi' al-jawāmi'*, II, 531–532). He frequently commented on the Azharis' lack of originality (ibid., II, 247, 455). In criticizing the Azharis in this manner, he was showing his loyalty to the dominant class.
51. This was written at a time of recentralization in Moroccan history.
52. Al-'Aṭṭār, *Al-Inshā'*, p. 50; Ibrahim Salama, *Enseignement islamique en l'Egypte*, p. 250; al-'Aṭṭār's student al-Ṭaḥṭawī had a similar preoccupation with syllogism and analogy (*Takhliṣ al-ibriz fī talkhīṣ Bāriz*, pp. 291–292).
53. Toderini, *De la littérature des Turcs*, I, 71; al-Ṣabbān's work was *Ḥāshiyā 'alā sharḥ Mullā Ḥanaṭī 'alā al-ādāb al-'aḍudiya*.
54. Al-'Aṭṭār, "Ḥāshiyā 'alā sharḥ al-Bahnīsī . . .," folios 71B–72A; al-Ḥusaynī, "Sharḥ al-umm al-musammā bi murshid al-anām li birr umm al-imām," p. 39.
55. Laoust, *Contribution à une étude de la méthodologie canonique de Taqī al-dīn Aḥmad b. Taimīya*, p. 8; idem, *Essai sur les doctrines sociales et politiques de Taqī al-dīn Aḥmad b. Taimīya*, pp. 514–523. The Wahhābīs held a distinct view in their denial of the use of *qiyās* in *fiqh*. In this they differed from the main Ḥanbalī tradition.
56. Al-'Aṭṭār, "Ḥāshiyā 'alā sharḥ al-Bahnīsī . . .," folio 81A.
57. Al-'Aṭṭār, "Ḥāshiyat al-'Aṭṭār 'alā sharḥ Mullā Ḥanaṭī," folio 3 (App. III, no. 38). Some suggestion of the Wahhābī problem can be found on folio 27B, where al-'Aṭṭār stressed that the Ḥanbalīs were like the Ash'arīs in being among the first to accept the use of *qiyās*. The Wahhābīs, as stated above, deviated from Ḥanbalī tradition on this point.

8. The Reform Period, 1815–1837, and the Development of Neoclassical Culture

1. Muḥammad al-Bahī, *Al-'Ilmāniya wa'l-Islām bayn al-fikr wa'l-taṭbiq*, p. 40. Most works on modernization fail to see this. The model is "the West" and "is secular"; e.g., Berkes, *Development of Secularism in Turkey*, stresses the role of Tanzimat technicalism as a background for the Young Turks, passing lightly over the role of the Bektashiya and other mystical groups in the same process, as it has no ready analogue in modern Western history.
2. Lucien Goldmann, *The Philosophy of the Enlightenment*, pp. 62, 53–65 passim; Bryan Wilson, *Religion in Secular Society*, a sociological study of the Church

- of England in the twentieth century; Eric Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, pp. 133, 219–220.
3. Abdel-Malek, *Idéologie et renaissance nationale de l’Egypte moderne*, pp. 135–136; M. Levey, *The Medical Formulary of al-Samarqandī*; a later example of such a dictionary is Fabre, “*Kitāb al-shudhḥūr al-dhahabiya fī’l-alfāz al-ṭib-bīya*” (1851), a collective work on medicine.
 4. De Sacy, “Notice . . .,” *Journal des Savans*, 1817, p. 726. When Lane arrived in Cairo, he was able to buy a copy of *Tāj al-‘arūs*, copied by Naṣr al-Ḥurfnī (Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon*, I, v). He later worked closely with one of al-Zabidī’s students, Muḥammad al-Ṭaṭṭāwī (see below).
 5. Aḥmad b. ‘Alī al-Mas‘ūd, [*Hadhihi majmū‘a fī ‘ilm al-taṣrīf*], ed. Hasan al-‘Aṭṭār (App. III, no. 46). Al-‘Aṭṭār made certain corrections which appeared on p. 3.
 6. Al-‘Aṭṭār, “*Hāshiyat al-‘Aṭṭār ‘alā lāmiyat al-aḥ‘āl li Ibn Mālik*” (copy dated 1820/1236) (App. III, no. 45). The original text by Ibn Mālik (died 672) is al-Azhar, Cairo, 119 ‘Ilm al-ṣarfī. The commentators included a later Turkish writer, al-Mullā Bahā’ Statmīr [Sanfarī] Bek. A second example is “*Hāshiyat al-‘Aṭṭār ‘alā sharḥ ‘Iṣām ‘alā al-risāla al-‘aḍudiya*” (Aḥmadī Mosque, Ṭanṭā, 8/558), dated approximately 1815 (App. III, no. 57).
 7. Al-‘Aṭṭār, “*Hāshiya ‘alā lāmiyat al-aḥ‘āl li Ibn Mālik*,” quotes from the *Diwān* of Ibn Sahl al-Andalusī, which he had edited around 1814.
 8. See al-‘Aṭṭār and Muṣṭafā al-Badrī al-Dimyāṭī, “*Al-Farq bayn al-jam‘ wa ism al-jam‘ wa ism al-jins al-jamā‘i wa’l-fardi*” (Dār al-Kutub, Cairo, 1294 Naḥw, n.d.). This was written in *saj‘*, probably at the request of some influential person who wanted this as an ornament. A specialist in the Arabic language, known to have been alive in 1876/1293, named Muṣṭafā al-Badrī al-Dimyāṭī al-Shāfi‘ī can be found in ‘Umar Riḍā Kakhāla, *Mu‘jam al-mu‘allifin wa tarājim al-‘arabiya*, XII, 244. He is listed in this source as having written a work bearing this title. The work was no doubt composed after 1815.
 9. Abdel-Malek, *Idéologie et renaissance nationale de l’Egypte moderne*, p. 330, citing Hans Wehr.
 10. Jamāl al-dīn al-Shayyāl, “The First Cultural Contacts between Egypt and the West in the Nineteenth Century,” conference paper, American University in Cairo–Columbia University Seminar, July–August 1965.
 11. Al-‘Aṭṭār, *Al-Inshā’*; Salama, *Enseignement Islamique en l’Egypte*, p. 199; al-Jabartī, *‘Ajā’ib al-aḥṣār fī’l-tarājim wa-l-akhbār*, IV, 232. Several others were also published.
 12. Al-Zabidī, “*Tahqīq al-Waṣā’il li Ma‘rifat al-mukātabāt wa’l-rasā’il*.”
 13. Al-‘Aṭṭār, *Al-Inshā’*, pp. 101–102.
 14. Al-Kilānī, *Al-Adab al-miṣri fī ḥukm al-‘Uthmānī*, pp. 172–190.
 15. Al-Marṣafī, *Al-Waṣīla al-adabiya*, II, 576–703.
 16. Abdel-Malek, *Idéologie et renaissance nationale de l’Egypte moderne*, pp. 136–137.
 17. Al-‘Aṭṭār, *Hāshiya ‘alā sharḥ jāmi‘ al-jawāmi‘*, II, 513, on attempting to understand the mystical tradition of Ibn al-‘Arabī, cited by al-Ṭaṭṭāwī in *Takhlīs al-ibriz fī talkhīs Bariz*, p. 57; al-Ṭaṭṭāwī continued al-‘Aṭṭār’s interest in Ibn Sahl, e.g., *Takhlīs*, pp. 101, 282–284; on the literary interview between al-Sa‘ātī (a student of ‘Abd al-Raḥman al-Jabartī) and al-‘Aṭṭār, see al-Ṭaṭṭāwī, *Rawdat al-madāris al-miṣriya*, I (1869/1287), no. 18, p. 35; no. 19, p. 34.
 18. Deny, “*Quatre Lettres de Mehmet Ali de l’Egypte*,” pp. 126–127, Khayret Efendi, *Riyād al-kutabā’ wa hiyaḍ al-udabā’*, pp. 312–313.

19. Al-Ṭaḥṭāwī, *Takhliṣ al-ibriz fi talkhiṣ Bariz*, pp. 129–131, discusses al-Ḥarīrī studies in Europe, and his debt to al-ʿAṭṭār. Among the *maqāmāt* of interest to him were Chesterfield's *Letters*, Montesquieu's *Persian Letters*, and other modern writers, showing of course what he took the *maqāma* to be. For letter writing as a forerunner of the novel, e.g., *Clarissa*, see Ian Watt, *The Rise of the Novel*, chap. 1. Al-ʿAṭṭār had literary discussions with Lebanese *maqāma* writer Buṭrus Karāma (Ḥasan, *Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār*, pp. 31–33).
20. ʿAbd al-Raḥman al-Rāfiʿi, *Shuʿarāʾ al-waṭaniyya, tarājimuḥum wa shiʿruḥum al-waṭani*, begins with al-Ṭaḥṭāwī. For al-ʿAṭṭār, see Taha Ḥusayn and others (eds.), *Muqatafaʾāt min kutub al-adab al-ʿarabi*, I, 246; II, 246 (App. III, no. 90).
21. Dīwān Muḥammad Shihab al-dīn, he praised Ibrāhīm on his return from Syria, pp. 35–36. ʿAlī Efendi al-Darwish, *Al-Ishʿār bi ḥamid al-ashʿār*.
22. Al-ʿAṭṭār, *Ḥashiya ʿalā sharḥ al-Khabīṣī*, p. 215. The best sources for the range of his poetic readings in the later part of his life are (1) *Ḥashiya ʿalā sharḥ jāmiʿ al-jawāmiʿ*, I, 8, 214, 249, 316, 326, 446; II, 195, 552, 247, 255, 332, 448, 453, 466, 506, 510, 513, 514, 527, and (2) *Ḥashiya ʿalā sharḥ al-Isāghūji*, pp. 19, 25, 62.
23. Rom Landau, *The Philosophy of Ibn al-ʿArabi*, pp. 85–86. Al-ʿAṭṭār cited the *Kitāb al-musamārāt* in his *Inshāʾ*, p. 95. He was praised for his knowledge of Ibn al-ʿArabi in general and especially his knowledge of the literary work *Turjumān al-ashwaq*. See Khayret Efendi, *Riyāḍ al-kutubāʾ wa ḥiyāḍ al-udabāʾ*, pp. 312–313.
24. Al-ʿAṭṭār's interest in music and musical instruments is mentioned by his son (see Mubārak, *Al-Khiṭaṭ al-tawfiqiyya al-jadida*, IV, 30). Al-ʿAṭṭār's theories are discussed in "Ḥāshiyat al-ʿAṭṭār ʿalā sharḥ Qāḍi Zadeh fi'l-handasa," folio 52. For a discussion of the Ikhwānīan theory of music and the intellectual unity which al-ʿAṭṭār opposed, see Seyyid Hossein Nasr, *An Introduction to Islamic Cosmological Doctrines*, p. 45.
25. Al-ʿAṭṭār, "Risāla fi taḥqīq al-khilāfa al-Islāmiyya wa manāqib al-khilāfa al-ʿUthmāniyya," no date (App. III, no. 58), manuscript thanks to Nijāh Maḥmūd al-Ghunaymī of Al-Azhar University. The work resembles one of its most probable sources, Ḥusayn Khuja b. ʿAlī (d. 1735), "Bashāʾir Ahl al-ʿimān bi futūḥāt Āl ʿUthmān"; cf. Abdesslem, *Les Historiens tunisiens*, pp. 208, 219–220. Husayn Khuja was a Tunisian writer influenced by Ibn Khaldūn.
26. Al-ʿAṭṭār, "Risāla fi taḥqīq al-khilāfa al-Islāmiyya wa manāqib al-khilāfa al-ʿUthmāniyya," folio 13.
27. Ibid.
28. Ibid., folio 15.
29. Ibid., folios 33–34.
30. Al-ʿAṭṭār, *Ḥashiya ʿalā sharḥ jāmiʿ al-jawāmiʿ*, II, 487.
31. Al-Maqrizī, *Al-Bayān wa'l-arāb ʿan mā bi arḍ Miṣr min al-aʿrāb* (App. III, no. 59), utilizing in part the manuscript of al-Maqrizī, on which were written some comments by Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār, which comments the editor retained in the printed edition, see esp. p. 73, also pp. 9–10.
32. Ibid., p. 73. Al-ʿAṭṭār was in a sense imposing these categories on the *muhaddith* al-Maqrizī. The background for al-ʿAṭṭār was the eighteenth-century fascination with, and dependence on, commercial tribes. He attacks their ʿAlidism and even attacked the commercial Fāṭimids while praising the Khilāfa of the agrarian ʿAbbāsids and Ottomans.
33. Al-Ṭaḥṭāwī, *Takhliṣ al-ibriz fi talkhiṣ Bariz*, p. 244. Elsewhere he gave a typology

of nations based on their levels of development: barbarism—human community—civilization, a sort of pre-Comtian evolutionism based on Ibn Khaldūn (*ibid.*, pp. 60–61).

34. Lane, *Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, p. 227.
35. Al-Ṭaḥṭāwī, *Takhlīṣ al-ibṛiz fī talkhīṣ Bārīz* (al-ʿAṭṭār's comments on pp. 53, 56). In this period (1830), the idea of travel was increasingly connected with government mission to Europe and much less associated with travel to Islamic countries as in the past. There is thus in these comments a certain obvious social orientation.
36. Al-Ṭaḥṭāwī, *Manāḥij al-albāb al-miṣriya*, pp. 375–376, stated that he had read "Kitāb taqwīm al-buldān" of Abū'l-Fidā', as well as other books, with al-ʿAṭṭār. This contains a number of marginal comments by al-ʿAṭṭār dated 1833. Professor Layla ʿAbd al-Laṭīf of ʿAyn Shams University copied the relevant portions for me.
37. The section is called "Dhikr umam al-ʿArab wa Aḥwālulhum wa mulūkuhum qabla al-Islām," which is pp. 160–193 of *Bidayat al-quḍamāʾ*.
38. Abū'l-Fidā', "Kitāb taqwīm al-buldān," p. 3 (marginal notes of al-ʿAṭṭār) (App. III, no. 60); al-ʿAṭṭār also wrote in an earlier work, however, that Damā'wund, a mountain supposedly in Ceylon (Sarandīb), was the highest in the world (al-ʿAṭṭār, "Sharḥ al-ʿAṭṭār al-musammā bi rāḥat al-abdān ʿalā nuzhat al-adhḥān," folio 22A). On folio 139A, he cites "Kitāb al-buldān" as a medical source. "Sharḥ al-ʿAṭṭār al-musammā bi rāḥat al-abdān ʿalā nuzhat al-adhḥān" is the earliest writing by al-ʿAṭṭār to discuss equivalents such as the above (Indian, Turkish, Arabic); cf. folio 40B.
39. Abū'l-Fidā', "Kitāb taqwīm al-buldān," p. 4. The book was not identified. Other Turkish historical books which al-ʿAṭṭār referred to gave accounts of al-Azīq, whom he said were Turks now living under Turkish rule; and (p. 12) he mentioned the Kupchiks from still other sources.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 3; J. Heyworth-Dunne, "Rifāʿah Badawī Rāfiʿi al-Ṭaḥṭāwī: The Egyptian Revivalist," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 10 (1940–1942): 399–415, esp. p. 412; F. Taeschner, "Djughrafiya," *Encyclopedia of Islam*, 2d ed., II, 575–590.
41. Al-Ṭaḥṭāwī, *Takhlīṣ al-ibṛiz fī talkhīṣ Bārīz*, pp. 107–108. Among the classical works which influenced al-Ṭaḥṭāwī was al-Qazwīnī's "ʿAjāʾib al-makhlūqāt wa gharāʾib al-mawjūdāt." This book included the idea of America and five continents, according to al-Ṭaḥṭāwī (*ibid.*, p. 69), but where the Europeans had more precise information (as opposed to theories), al-Ṭaḥṭāwī was prepared to accept it. Al-Qazwīnī claimed, according to al-Ṭaḥṭāwī, that palm trees existed only in Islamic countries. However, the French, he said, found them in America (*ibid.*, p. 112).
42. Al-Ṭaḥṭāwī, *Al-Kunūz al-Mukhtār fī kashf al-araḍī wa'l-buḥār*, pp. 129–143, esp. p. 131. It seems worth noting that this decisive break occurred in his thinking at the moment of the greatest strength of his social class vis-à-vis the traditional middle class. It is worth asking why he relied on Newton rather than Kepler, the mystic.
43. Edward W. Lane, *A Thousand and One Nights*, II, 65.
44. A. Demeerseman, "Une memoire celebre qui prefigure l'evolution moderne en Islam," *Institut des Belles Lettres Arabes* (1955): 7.
45. Alexander Scholch, *Agypten den Agyptern: Die Politische und Gesellschaftliche Krise der Jahre 1878–1882 in Agypten*, pp. 53–125. Thanks to Eric Davis of Rutgers University.

9. *The World Market as a Limiting Factor in the Development of Neoclassicism*

1. An article on the history of Egyptian and Turkish medicine in the eighteenth century is forthcoming.
2. Al-ʿAṭṭār, "Sharḥ al-ʿAṭṭār al-musammā bi rāḥat al-abdān 'alā nuzhat al-adhhān," folio 5A, 212A. He gave an incident in his life as a reason for his decision to seriously study medicine. He was traveling to Izmir with a servant boy who contracted smallpox and began perspiring heavily. Al-ʿAṭṭār attempted to apply henna, according to a well-known remedy, to close the pores. But every day the boy got sicker until he died (folio 250A). On henna as a treatment, see G. S. Colin, "Ḥinnā," *Encyclopedia of Islam*, 2d ed., III, 461. The use of this anecdote by al-ʿAṭṭār was to dissociate himself from popular medicine.
3. Dāʿūd al-Anṭākī, "Nuzhat al-adhhān fī iṣlāḥ al-abdān," folios 7–8. A discussion of occult elements in Dāʿūd's best-known work, the *Tadhkara*, and notably some references to Idrīs (Hermes Trismegisthus) are contained in Martin Plessner, "Dāʿūd al-Anṭākī's Tenth-Century Encyclopedia on Medicine, Natural History, and Occult Sciences," *Congrès d'Histoire des Sciences* 10 (1962): 635–637.
4. For Dāʿūd al-Anṭākī in the tradition of medicine and *ḥadīth*, see Ḥasan ʿAbd al-Salām, *Dhakīrat al-ʿAṭṭār aw tadhkarat Dāʿūd fī rawiyatihi fī ʿilm al-ḥadīth*, not located.
5. There can be no doubt of the later influence of the *Tadhkara*, but the *Nuzhat al-adhhān* is far more obscure. One commentary was located which was written before that of al-ʿAṭṭār in 1757/1170 by al-Sayyid Muḥammad Riḍā b. al-Sayyid al-Fayḍallah.
6. Al-ʿAṭṭār, "Sharḥ al-ʿAṭṭār al-musammā bi rāḥat al-abdān 'alā nuzhat al-adhhān," folios 5–11. Concerning the charge that al-Anṭākī was merely a collector, one of course cannot easily judge. Al-Anṭākī indicates that he worked from his own experiences ("Nuzhat al-adhhān fī iṣlāḥ al-abdān," folios 5A, 12B). These might of course have been the common experiences of everyone. Al-ʿAṭṭār also accused Dāʿūd of including material which was not part of medicine (folios 12–13), for example, on plants and animals, which he said were part of agricultural sciences. These are mistakes of logic.
7. M. Meyerhof and J. Schacht, "'Alā' al-dīn . . . al-Qurashī," *Encyclopedia of Islam*, 2d ed., III, 897–898. Al-ʿAṭṭār, "Sharḥ al-ʿAṭṭār al-musammā bi rāḥat al-abdān 'alā nuzhat al-adhhān," folio 102B. This is not the well-known ʿAbd al-Laṭīf al-Baghdādī (Mawāqif al-dīn al-Mawaṣilī), known as Ibn al-Labbād (born 1162/557), also a critic of Ibn Sīnā.
8. Seyyid Hossein Nasr, *Science and Civilization in Islam*, pp. 213–214; Paul Ghaliounji, *Ibn al-Nafīs*, pp. 102–104. Nasr erred here in identifying the correct work of Ibn al-Nafīs.
9. Al-ʿAṭṭār, "Sharḥ al-ʿAṭṭār al-musammā bi rāḥat al-abdān 'alā nuzhat al-adhhān," folio 98B. Why on this crucial passage did al-ʿAṭṭār actually agree with al-Qurashī, whose relevant work he cites (p. 35A), and yet claim that he opposed him? Was he undermined by his copyist, or were the "circumstances" in Damascus, which he referred to above, not conducive to an onslaught on Ibn Sīnā?
10. Seyyid Hossein Nasr, *Islamic Studies*, chapters on Hermes, the chemistry of Rāzī, and Rāzī's rejection of prophecy and *taʿwīl*.
11. Al-ʿAṭṭār, *Hāshiyat al-ʿAṭṭār ʿalā sharḥ jamʿ al-jawāmīʿ*, II, 512.
12. Al-ʿAṭṭār, "Sharḥ al-ʿAṭṭār al-musammā bi rāḥat al-abdān 'alā nuzhat al-adhhān," folios 72–73. Similarly: the importance of empirical anatomy for being able to

diagnose correctly genito-urinary diseases (folio 104A).

13. Ibid., folio 248A, attacking the "Sharḥ al-Kazarūnī 'alā al-qānūn." He was of course also attacking the mid-eighteenth-century tradition of European medicine, aligning himself with the findings of the new positivist tradition.
14. Al-'Aṭṭār, "Sharḥ al-'Aṭṭār al-musammā bi rāḥat al-abdān 'alā nuzhat al-adhḥān," folio 78A. In this way he was able to introduce a range of figures including Qusṭā' b. Lūqā' on the subject of insomnia (folio 117B). This distinction could not have endeared him to the Damascenes of 1814.
15. Ibid., folio 109, on living in the wind, etc.; folio 134C on the winter in Damascus versus the winter in Cairo; folios 153B–154 on the clothes and foods used, etc.; on public baths, folio 155A, where he reveals great familiarity with their construction. Such knowledge was presumably available; see Dā'ūd al-Anṭākī, "Al-Tuḥfa al-bakriya fī aḥkām al-istiḥmām al-kullīya wa'l-juz'īya."
16. Al-'Aṭṭār, "Sharḥ al-'Aṭṭār al-musammā bi rāḥat al-abdān 'alā nuzhat al-adhḥān," folios 109 and 134B on climatic regions; folio 225A on the Delta and the habits of its people.
17. Article on Egyptian science forthcoming.
18. Lane, *Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, pp. 227 and 223, respectively.
19. Al-'Aṭṭār, *Ḥaṣhiya 'alā sharḥ al-Balidī 'alā al-maqlāt* (App. III, no. 18). This is a Māturīdite approach.
20. Ibid., pp. 16, 296–297, 301. Here Māturīdite theology merges with utilitarianism.
21. Al-'Aṭṭār, *Ḥaṣhiya 'alā sharḥ jamī' al-jawāmi'*, II, 506. This remark has been quoted in a number of books. See 'Abd al-Mit'āl al-Ṣa'īdī, *Tārīkh al-īṣṭāḥ fī 'l-Azhar*, pp. 20–21; al-Ḥusaynī, "Sharḥ al-umm al-musammā bi murshid al-anām li birr umm al-imām," p. 34.
22. Al-'Aṭṭār, "Sharḥ al-'Aṭṭār al-musammā bi rāḥat al-abdān 'alā nuzhat al-adhḥān," folio 67A. Al-'Aṭṭār's sources on medicine, apart from al-Rāzī, include "Al-Qif," "Umda fī ṣinā'at al-jirāḥa," and the "Book" of al-Zahrāwī (folio 219B), al-Jāhiz, "Kitāb al-ḥayawān," and the "Sharḥ qānūnjā" of Ibn Rushd (folio 51A).
23. Al-'Aṭṭār, *Ḥaṣhiyat al-'Aṭṭār 'alā sharḥ al-Balidī*, p. 301.
24. Sami Bey, "Fī shukr al-'ināya wa bayān al-ḥikma," *Al-Waqd'ī 'al-Miṣṭīya*, no. 33 (June 3, 1828/end of Dhū'l-Ḥijja 1244), discusses his view on *al-ḥikma* and on Shaykh 'Abd al-Qādir al-Jilānī. See also al-'Aṭṭār's student al-Taṭṭāwī, who wrote a work on the gloss of al-'Aṭṭār on al-Sijā'ī (Kratchkowsky, *Ḥayat Muḥammad 'Iyād al-Taṭṭāwī*, p. 71), but it was not located. There is, however, an unidentified manuscript in al-Azhar which fits the description but which is defective: "Taqrīr 'alā ḥaṣhiyat al-'Aṭṭār 'alā maqlāt al-Sijā'ī."
25. In the eighteenth century, *ilm al-hay'a* as astronomy was scarcely studied in Egypt. A possible exception is the work of Muḥammad al-Ṣabbān (unlocated) called *Kitāb fī 'ilm al-hay'a*. Ibrāhīm Khūrī, *Makḥṭūṭāt Dār al-Kutub al-Zāhiriya: 'ilm al-hay'a*, lists works by Ḥasan al-Jabartī on astronomy (!).
26. Al-'Aṭṭār's previous Wafā'īya formation still showed when he wrote a commentary on an essay by al-Āmili ("Risālat tashriḥ al-aflāk fī 'ilm al-hay'a"; App. III, no. 22). While al-'Aṭṭār's commentary could not be located, the original was obviously part of the Ikhwānīan corpus. The text cited above was commented on at least six times before al-'Aṭṭār wrote his commentary (Brockelmann, *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur*, S2, p. 595), mainly by Persians and Indians.
27. Al-'Aṭṭār, "Ḥaṣhiyat al-'Aṭṭār 'alā sharḥ Qāḍī Zadeh al-Rumī 'alā ashkal al-ta'āsīs fī 'ilm al-handasa." The basic text was written by Shams al-din Muḥammad b.

Ashrāf al-Samarqandī. A partial translation of this is Hamid Dilgan, "Demonstration du Ve postulat d'Euclide par Shams al-dīn al-Samarqandī: Traduction de l'ouvrage aschkal-ut-tasis de Samarkandi," *Révue de l'Histoire des Sciences et de Leurs Applications* 13 (1960): 191–196. The name of the commentary is *Ta'sīs al-ashkal*.

28. Al-'Aṭṭār, "Hāshiya 'alā sharḥ ta'sīs," folios 41–50; Nasr, *Science and Civilization*, pp. 80–82. Al-'Aṭṭār's source of information on Qāḍī Zadeh, he said, was a work (unlocated) called "Tārīkh bashā'ir al-īmān fī dawlat al-'Uthmān" (folios 41–42). He was attracted to the scholars who were involved in the astronomical observatories, perhaps because the observatory was an Islamic invention which was accepted as modern by the West. Whatever the reason, al-Taḥṭāwī was also particularly interested in observatories and spent some time in the one in Paris (*Takhlīṣ ibrīz fī talkhīṣ Barīz*, p. 213).
29. Among the early figures whom he correctly saw as "continuators of Euclid" were Ibn Haytham (al-'Aṭṭār, "Hāshiya 'alā sharḥ ta'sīs," folio 69B), Thābit b. Qurra (71B), and Ḥunayn b. Ishāq (87A). He then listed later India figures whose identification is rather problematic: Zuhayr al-dīn al-Hindī (86A), and Khalīl al-dīn al-Hindī (87B). The only Arab source he respected was Tāj al-dīn al-Ṣa'īdī. He cited "Hāshiyat al-Birghundī 'alā mulakhkhaṣ al-Jaghminī" on the subject of the relation of the point to the line (folio 36B).
30. Al-'Aṭṭār, "Hāshiya 'alā sharḥ ta'sīs," folio 54A. This was "Taḥrīr al-manāẓir" (not located). Al-'Aṭṭār was partially aware that in following al-'Āmilī he was taking a false step, but in this work (1817) there is no criticism voiced of him. He noticed, for example, that the theorems in geometry were used by the *ishraqiyyīn* as the basis of their system, and he wished to dissociate himself from them (folio 56B). He likewise opposed the theory of the *ṭabf'iyīn* (56B). Elsewhere al-'Aṭṭār criticized their views on *al-handasa* and in other fields (51B).
31. Ibid., folio 40. "The cosmos of the Ikhwān is the traditional, finite cosmos beyond which there is 'neither void nor plenum.' Moreover, they equate the heavens of the fixed stars with the *kursī*, or pedestal (Qur'ān, II/255) and the ninth heaven with the 'arch or throne' (Qur'ān, IX/129) in order to conform to Quranic cosmology" (Nasr, *Introduction to Islamic Cosmological Doctrines*, p. 76).
32. Al-'Aṭṭār, "Hāshiya 'alā sharḥ ta'sīs," folios 50–51. Here he cites the *Kashkāl* in solving a problem in the measurement of angles.
33. Al-'Aṭṭār, "Hāshiya 'alā sharḥ ta'sīs," folios 50–51; Nasr, *Introduction to Islamic Cosmological Doctrines*, pp. 46–47, 48–49.
34. David Pingree, "'Ilm al-Hay'a," *Encyclopedia of Islam*, 2d ed., III, 1135–1138. Pingree discusses the School of Marāgha and the star charts, but does not see them, as al-'Āmilī did, in terms of their relationship to the Persian mystical tradition.
35. Hobsbawm, *Age of Revolution*, p. 282; see also p. 293.
36. Georges Gurvitch, *The Social Frameworks of Knowledge*, pp. 174–198, on European cognitive systems in different historical epochs.
37. Hobsbawm, *Age of Revolution*, p. 285.

Appendix I. The Maqāmat al-'Aṭṭār

1. Al-'Aṭṭār, *Maqāmat al-'Aṭṭār*. This is published in conjunction with a longer *maqāma* of Imām al-Suyūṭī, the full title of which is *Hadhihi al-maqāma al-*

*suyūtiya li'l-imām al-ḥafīẓ Jalāl al-dīn Sīdī 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Suyūti wa fi mayzala bi maqāma li mawlāna al-Ḥammām al-shaykh Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār. The maqāma of al-'Aṭṭār appears on pp. 91–96 (Dār al-Kutub, 7574 Adab). This work was translated by Oscar Rescher, *Orientalische Miscellen*, pp. 229–234; also discussed in al-Kilānī, *Fi rubū' al-Azbakiya*, pp. 51–65 passim.*

2. Al-'Aṭṭār, *Maqāmat al-'Aṭṭār*, pp. 92–94.

3. *Ibid.*, pp. 94–96. It is a matter for regret that in all the printed sources by the French for this period, al-'Aṭṭār's name does not appear. This makes even the identity of those French Orientalists whom he knew a matter for conjecture. We conclude that it was R. Raige whom al-Khashshāb and al-'Aṭṭār were both fond of to the point of a certain rivalry. Al-Jabartī, *'Aja'ib al-athār fi'l-tarājim wa'l-akhbār*, IV, 230, records some amatory poetry which al-'Aṭṭār wrote for Raige which is very similar to the text of the *maqāma* presented above. R. Raige (1770–1807), who lived in the shadow of a better-known Orientalist, Venture de Paradis, was an Arabic translator who had only minor responsibilities. Information concerning Raige is quite limited because of his early death and relatively uneventful life. He is remembered in the *Déscription de l'Égypte* only for his involvement in an Egyptological controversy concerning the age of the Zodiac of Dandara, see Gabriel Guémard, *Histoire et bibliographie critique de la Commission de Science et Artes de l'Institut de l'Égypte*, p. 58; G. Guémard, "Les Orientalistes de l'Armée de l'Orient," *Revue de l'Histoire des Colonies* (1928), pp. 140–142. The friendship of Raige and al-'Aṭṭār would make a certain amount of sense in that they were the same age and both rather uninvolved in the events of the day. Al-Kilānī, *Fi rubū' al-Azbakiya*, pp. 56–57, also states that his French friend was Raige.

Appendix II. Al-'Aṭṭār's Itinerary from 1802 to 1810

1. *Ḥashīyat al-'Aṭṭār 'alā sharḥ al-azhariya*, pp. 1, 125. In the information which is presented here, we find al-Ḥusaynī ("Sharḥ al-umm al-musammā bi murshid al-anām li birr umm al-imām," p. 37) in more or less agreement that the period in Damascus was the last (he relies on Damascus sources), but he contradicts himself in presenting another account (p. 35), which appears to be a paraphrase of Mubārak Al-Khiṭaṭ *al-tawfiqiya al-jadida*, IV, 38–39. Al-Ḥusaynī wrote in the exact phrases of Mubārak: "Then he traveled at that time to Syria [i.e., on leaving Egypt] and he stayed in Damascus for a while, as the poets say, 'without a care,' as was the custom of many 'ulamā'." Al-Ḥusaynī then omits Mubārak's long description of what supposedly transpired and jumps to the statement that upon leaving Damascus he went to the Turkish lands, stayed there a long time, went to Albania, and then came back to Egypt. All sources agree that he came back to Egypt in 1815. However, following al-'Aṭṭār's own words, this would suggest that he was in Damascus between 1810 and 1815, with perhaps short trips from the city, and that he had finished his sojourn in Turkey. Al-'Aṭṭār must be regarded as his own best witness in these details, as Mubārak and al-Ḥusaynī gathered their materials from his relatives in Egypt long after he was dead. Thus, the first tentative conclusion which we may state is that Mubārak inverted al-'Aṭṭār's visit to Syria by putting it first instead of last. Evidence which will be presented in the next section, on al-'Aṭṭār in Syria, also supports this view. Al-Bayṭār, *Hilyat al-bashir fi tārikh al-qam*

- al-thālith 'ashar*, I, 490, an important source, stated that, when he went out of Egypt in 1812/1217, he went to the Turkish lands, then went to Damascus after staying in Turkey for a long time; then he came to Damascus in 1225/1810. This is drawn from the life of Muḥammad al-'Aṭṭār.
2. Al-'Aṭṭār, "Hāshiyat al-'Aṭṭār 'alā sharḥ Qāḍī Zadeh," folio 100B.
 3. Al-'Aṭṭār, "Hāshiyat al-'Aṭṭār 'alā sharḥ natā'ij al-afkār," p. 407.
 4. *Ibid.*, pp. 252, 406. More collateral evidence might exist from Alexandretta. On p. 406 he indicates that his gloss on this grammar book was greatly delayed by the poorness of the copy which he had access to, forcing him to reconstruct it piece by piece and finally to procure additional copies, and that this occurred while he was teaching in Alexandretta. Al-Ḥusaynī, "Sharḥ al-umm al-musammā bi murshid al-anām li birr umm al-imām," p. 38, states that this was a very detailed work written for Turkish students. This would tend to support the view of a longer stay in Alexandretta, dating at least from 1806.
 5. Al-'Aṭṭār, "Hāshiyat al-'Aṭṭār 'alā sharḥ Muḥammad al-Bahnist 'alā risālat al-walādiya li Muḥammad al-Mar'asht," folios 71B-72A.
 6. *Ibid.*, p. 35. The work called "Tuḥfa" (not located) was probably entitled in full "Tuḥfat gharīb al-waṭan fī taḥqīq naṣrat al-Shaykh Abī'l-Ḥasan." This was described as an attack on the commentary of Khadimi-Zadeh on the text called "Al-Ṭarīqa al-muḥammadiya." Al-'Aṭṭār was defending an Ash'arite position (see Chapter 7). Mubārak, *Al-Khiṭaṭ al-tawfiqīya al-jadīda*, IV, 39.
 7. Al-Bayṭār, *Hilyat al-bāshir fī tārikh al-qam al-thālith 'ashar*, I, 490-491.
 8. Sāmī al-Badrāwī, "Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār," in *A'lām al-fikr al-islāmī fī'l-'aṣr al-ḥadīth*, ed. Aḥmad Taymūr, p. 26.
 9. Muḥammad al-'Aṭṭār, "Sharḥ 'alā manẓūmat al-'Aṭṭār fī'l-tashrīḥ," folio 1A.
 10. Al-'Aṭṭār, *Hāshiyat al-'Aṭṭār 'alā sharḥ 'alā jāmi' al-jawāmi'*, II, 533.
 11. Unsigned article, "Scutari," *Grand dictionnaire universel du XIX siècle*, ed. Pierre Larousse, XIV, 437. Among those who were buried there were some of the Badriyīn.
 12. Adnan Abdulhak, *La Science chez les Turcs ottomans*, p. 142. It is clear that the intent was to provide needed skills in military engineering.
 13. Guémard, *Une Oeuvre française*, p. 40. Stanford Shaw discounts the significance of these schools, pointing out that the technical schools went into a state of eclipse after 1788, when Louis XVI pulled out the French advisors, and that in any case instruction in them had been limited to elementary mathematics and the use of artillery. However, elsewhere Shaw characterizes the navy and army engineering schools as the most important part of the Nizām al-Jadīd because they created a corps of Western-trained, reform-minded specialists. Cf. Shaw, "The Established Ottoman Army Corps under Sultan Selim III," *Der Islam* 90 (1964): 177-178. Shaw also refers to the press in Scutari, which was, he states, founded in 1800 because of the growing need for textbooks in technical subjects for these schools (*ibid.*, p. 183).
 14. Sylvestre de Sacy, *Bibliothèque imprimée*, pp. 331-333 nn. 1498-1506. See his article in *Mines de l'Orient* 4 (n.d.): 296 n. 593.
 15. For a discussion of the backward, pastoral economy of Scutari, Albania, see F. C. H. L. Pouqueville, *Voyage en Moree a Constantinople et en Albanie*, III, chap. 28-29, which convey a sense of the sheer difficulty of travel through the region. In the late eighteenth century, the region was in considerable turmoil. See Dennis N. Skiotis, "From Bandit to Pasha: First Steps in the Rise to Power of 'Ali of Tepelen, 1750-1784," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 2

[1971]: 243 n. 3. This source showed, for example, that 'Alī Bey was at war after 1787 with the rebellious Pasha of Scutari, Kārā Maḥmūd Bushātī. In 1807, a Bektashi Dervish opened a branch lodge in Kruya, near Scutari, but was later expelled. Little other intellectual life is reported in the early nineteenth century (F. W. Hasluck, *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans*, II, 590).

Glossary

adāb al-baḥṭh: argumentation

a'dad: numbers

adīb: litterateur

afātīn: troublemakers:

akhbār: events

'alim, *'ulama'* (pl.): an elite cleric

amīr: provincial bureaucrat

'amm: that which is general in logic

'aqīda: dogmatics, a special field in the scholastic corpus

'aṣāba: a social solidarity

'aṣabiya: group loyalty, solidarity

asānīd: chains

awliyā': saints

a'yān: provincial notables

badal al-muṣālaḥa: a fee paid to create an inherited tax farm

balāgha: the general field of rhetoric

barā'a: innocence

baraka: magical spiritual power

bāṭinan: hidden; esoteric

beratli: beneficiaries of capitulation agreements, such as the Syrian Christian community in Egypt

bey: an Ottoman official

burhan, *barahīn* (pl.): logical proof

dallāla: a woman who was able to enter the harems as both seller and creator of new tastes and new consumption habits

al-dawā'ir al-fālakiya: the domain of the stars

dhikr: meditation

dīn wa dawla: an expression conveying the unity of religion and state

dirāya: analysis of *ḥadīth* evidence

diwān: a decision-making body

efendī: an urban functionary

fahrasa: courses taught by the *shaykh*

fallāh, *fallāhun* (pl.): a peasant

falsafa: peripatetic philosophy

faqīh, *fuqahā'* (pl.): a systematic theologian

farāsikh: units of distance

fatwa, *fatāwī* (pl.): legal opinion on points of *fiqh*

fiqh: systematic theology

ghayb: the world of the unknowable

ghazal: love poetry

ghazwa: raid

ḥadīth, *aḥadīth* (pl.): the studies of the sayings of the Prophet

ḥadīth qudsī: sacred tradition

Hajj: the pilgrimage to Mecca

ḥalū ma'lūm: his condition is known, i.e., a homosexual

handasa: geometry, with topics in astronomy and engineering

ḥāra: quarter, in a city

ḥaṣṭiya, *ḥawāshī* (pl.): a gloss; commentary on commentary

hay'a: astronomy with geometry

ḥayl: a part of the medieval science of mechanics

ḥikma: gnosis; wisdom literature

ḥisba: urban maintenance system

ḥiyal: devices for getting around the prohibition of changing interest; lit., tricks

ḥukamā': specialists in *al-ḥikma*, or wisdom science

ḥulwān: annual tribute to the Porte from Egypt

iftā': the issuing of legal opinions

ijāza, *ijāzāt* (pl.): a document like a diploma given by a *shaykh*

ijmā': consensus as a method of resolving jurisprudential impasses, one of the roots of jurisprudence

ijtihād: reliance on self-judgment in theological matters

iktisāb: excessive profiteering

ilāhiyāt: theology

'ilm: scholastic science

'ilm al-bayān: a part of rhetoric

'ilm al-ḥadīth: the science of *ḥadīth* study

'ilm al-manāẓir: spherical geometry

'ilm al-qawāifa: the science of rhyme

'ilm al-taṣhrīḥ: empirical anatomy

'ilm al-waḍ': the rules of composition

iltizām, *iltizāmāt* (pl.): tax farm

imām: the continuator of the Prophet's divine nature

imāma: spiritual leadership of an *imām*

al-inshā': letter writing of an elegant type; composition writing

inshā': letter writing of an elegant type; composition writing

inshād: recitation

ishrāq: illuminationist, the quietist way in mysticism

ishtiqāq: the deriving of words from their roots

istidlāl: deduction

jabrīya: philosophical determinism

jadāl: argumentation

jald': the activist way in Ṣūfism

jarr al-athqāl: gravity, as a branch of medieval mechanics

jihād: intense spiritual struggle; sometimes, holy war

kalām: speculative theology

karāmāt: divine blessings

kasb: gain
kaṣḥf: illumination
khaliṭfa, khulafa' (pl.): lieutenant in a Ṣūfī *ṭarīqa*
khalwa: seclusion; lit., a cell
khāṣṣ, khawāṣṣ (pl.): the elite
kiswa: the cover of the Maḥmal, part of the Egyptian expenditure for the upkeep of the holy cities
kuhl: a salve used to treat bienorrheal ophthalmia
kunya: a surname

laqab: an honorific name

mabādi': principles
madhhab: orthodox legal tradition
maḍrasa: a religious training school associated with a mosque
maḥall tijāra: a place of trade
maḥdī: a charismatic leader claiming divine inspiration
Maḥmal: a sacred litter; see also *kiswa*
majlis, majālis (pl.): a salon
ma'mūr: provincial administrator
manāqib: special virtues
maqām: a shrine
maqāma, maqāmāt (pl.): an Arabic prose genre
māristān: a hospital
maṣlaḥa: general welfare
mawlāna: the lord or master
mawlid: an annual religious celebration commemorating a birthdate
Mawlid al-Nabī: the celebration of the Prophet's birthday
mawqūf: willed
mawwāl: colloquial poetry often sung to the accompaniment of a reed pipe
mīqāt: the science of time measurement
mīrī: the state land tax
mollas: religious bureaucratic officials
muftī: a state functionary and leading theologian
muḥaddith, muḥaddithun (pl.): a specialist in *ḥadīth* studies
muḥaqqiq, muḥaqqiqūn (pl.): one who takes an approach based on reason but within the bounds of the Sharī'a
muḥtasib, muḥtasibūn (pl.): a market inspector
mujtahid, mujtahidūn (pl.): one engaged in the practice of *ijtihād*, or self-judgment in jurisprudence
mulk: the secular aspect of rule in medieval political theory
multazim, multazimūn (pl.): a tax farmer
muqāṭa'a: a tax area
murattabāt: illegal fees paid to bureaucrats to retain land
murīd, murīdūn (pl.): a follower of the way of a Ṣūfī master
mursal: the chain of authorities for a given report back at least unto the second generation
murshid, murshidūn (pl.): a Ṣūfī guide, mentor
muṣṭalaḥ al-ḥadīth: lit., the study of the technical terms of *ḥadīth*
mutakallim, mutakallimūn (pl.): a student of speculative theology
muwashshaḥa, muwashshaḥāt (pl.): an Arabic poetry form

naḥt: the derivation of words:

najāsa: ritual impurity

naqīb: a functionary

nasab: genealogy

nāẓir, *nuzzār* (pl.): a superintendent of *awqāf*

nisba: attribution of occupation

qādī: the chief Ottoman judicial official in Egypt; judge

qāfiya: rhyme scheme

qaṣīda: a classical form of Arabic poetry

qiyās: analogy

qulluq: a police station

rahīm: an adjective expressing God's attribute of mercifulness

rahman: an adjective expressing God's attribute of mercifulness

ra'īs al-kuttāb: a high official of the central government

rajaz: a poetic metre

rak'a: the bending of the torso in prayer

raml: astrology

rāwī: a *ḥadīth* transmitter

ra'y: self-judgment, i.e., not drawn in a literal way from the Qur'an or *sunna*

ribḥ: interest

rīf: the [Egyptian] countryside

riḥla: spiritual travel

riwāq: the administrative and residential component of al-Azhar

riwāya: recounting of *ḥadīth*, in contrast to *dirāya*

ruh: soul, vital spirit (in medicine)

ṣaḥāba: the Companions of the Prophet Muhammad

saj': rhymed prose

sarrājūn: servants mounted on horseback as a new form of soldiery

shahāda: a diploma of spiritual progress in this period

shawāhid: sources of words; lit., witnesses

shaykh: an instructor in a mosque; other meanings include tribal chief, or village headman

shishm: a salve used to treat bienorrheal ophthalmia

shuhadā': martyrs

shurūṭ: conditions, here in the study of *ḥadīth*

sijāda: as in phrase Shaykh al-Sijāda, i.e., leader of a Ṣūfī order

silsila: a chain; *silsila* literature may give the links between the life of a Ṣūfī *shaykh* and the founder of his order

sunna: part of *ḥadīth*; lit., custom, usage, tradition

tabarruk: an inner religious strengthening

tafsīr: commentary on the Qur'an

tahdhīb: spiritual training

tahrif: inaccuracies

taḥnīya: the giving of an honorary name

talqīn: instruction

taqlīd: adherence to a tradition

taqrīr: a commentary on a gloss

ta'riḵh: history

ṭarīqa, ṭuruq (pl.): a mystical confraternity

tarjama, tarājim (pl.): the life of a notable individual

taṣawwuf: mysticism

tawakkul: trust in God, often manifested in withdrawal from earthly affairs

tawḥīd: theology of unity

ta'wīl: a derived meaning

tekke: a Şūfī monastery

ṭuhr: purity

'ulūm: scholastic sciences

umūr mawḥūma: imaginary subjects

uṣūl al-fiqh: the science of the roots of jurisprudence, here used as *uṣūl al-dīn*

uṣūliyyūn: orthodox jurists who use the traditional roots of jurisprudence

waḡba: obligation of the *fallāḡ* to provide the upkeep of the *multazim*.

Wālī: a high urban functionary

waqf, awqāf (pl.): property deeded by will

waṭanīya, waṭanīyāt (pl.): patriotic themes; poetry of the bureaucratic age

wazīr: a plenipotentiary

wikālat: wholesale trade houses

wilāya: guardianship

zaḡhal: an Arabic poetry form

zā'irjā: astrology

zāwiya: a Şūfī monastery

ziyārāt: visits for spiritual purposes to the tombs of the saints or the *ṣaḡāba*

Selected Bibliography

Reference Works

- Al-Baghdādī, Isma‘īl. *Hidāyat al-‘arifin asma’ al-mu‘allifin athār al-muṣannifin*. 2 vols. with supplement. Istanbul: Maṭba‘at al-Bahīya, 1955.
- Al-Bayṭār, ‘Abd al-Razzaq. *Ḥilyat al-bashar fī ta’rīkh al-qarn al-thālith ‘ashar*. 3 vols. Damascus: Majma‘ al-Lughā al-‘Arabīya, 1961.
- The major source for Syrian cultural life in the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth centuries. Supplemented by al-Shaṭṭī (see below).
- Brockelmann, Carl. *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur*. 5 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1937–1949.
- Bursali, Mehmed Ṭahir, *Othmanli müellifleri*. 2 vols. Istanbul, 1928/1346.
- Al-Daghastānī, ‘Alī Ḥilmī. *Fihris al-kutub al-Turkiya al-mawjūda fī l-Kutubkhāna al-Khidwtīya*. Cairo: al-Maṭba‘a al-‘Uthmāniya, 1888/1306.
- Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriya. *Fihris al-Khizāna al-Taymūriya*. 4 vols. Cairo: Dār al-Kutub, 1948–1950.
- . *Fihris al-kutub al-‘arabiya al-mahfūza bi Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriya*. 8 vols. Cairo: Dār al-Kutub, 1924–1942.
- . *Fihris al-kutub al-‘arabiya al-mahfūza bi l-kutubkhāna al-khidwtīya*. 7 vols. Cairo: Dār al-Kutub, 1887.
- Ellul, Jean, *Index des communications et memoires publiés à l’Institut de l’Egypte, 1849–1952*. Cairo: Imprimerie de l’Institut Français d’Archaeologie Orientale, 1950.
- Encyclopedia of Islam*. 4 vols. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1913–1937. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1960–.
- Al-Ḥasanī, ‘Abd al-Ḥayy b. Fakhr al-dīn. *Nuzhat al-khawāṭir wa bahjat al-masāmi‘ wa l-nawāzīr*. 10 vols. Hyderabad: Maṭba‘a Dā‘irat al-Ma‘ārif, 1946.
- Kahhāla, ‘Umar Riḍā. *Mu‘jam al-mu‘allifin wa tarājim al-‘arabiya*. 15 vols. Damascus: al-Maktaba al-‘Arabīya, 1937.
- Al-Kattānī, ‘Abd al-Ḥayy. *Fihris al-fahāris wa ithbāt wa mu‘jam al-ma‘ājim wa l-mashyakhāt wa l-musalsalat*. 2 vols. Fas: al-Maṭba‘a al-Jadīda, 1927/1346.
- Al-Khālidi, Ahmad Samīh. *Ahl al-‘ilm bayn Miṣr wa Filisṭīn*. Jerusalem: al-Maṭba‘a al-‘Asriya, n.d.
- Contains biographies of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Palestinian intellectuals.
- Khalīfa, Ḥājī. *Kashf al-zunūn ‘an asāmi al-kutub wa l-funūn*. 4 vols. Istanbul: Wikālat al-Ma‘ārif, 1941.
- Al-Khānī, ‘Abd al-Majīd al-Khālidi. *Al-Anwār al-quḍsiya fī manāqib al-Sādat al-Naqshbandīya*. Cairo: Maṭba‘at al-Sa‘āda, 1926/1344.
- A useful work for the lives of Naqshbandīs, whose order was the most important of the Sūfī orders of the Arab world between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries.

258 Selected Bibliography

- Khūrī, Ibrāhīm. *Makḥṭūṭāt Dār al-Kutub al-Zāhiriya*: 'Ilm al-hay'a. Damascus: Maṭba'a Majma' al-Lughā al-'Arabiya, 1969.
- Al-Maraghī, 'Abū'l-Wafā'. *Fihris al-kutub al-mawjūda bi'l-maktaba al-Azharīya ilā 1952/1371*. 6 vols. Cairo: Maṭba'at al-Azhar, 1952.
- Mukhtār, Muḥammad. *Al-Tawfiqāt al-ilhāmīya*. Cairo: Būlāq, 1898.
- Al-Murādī, Muḥammad Khalīl. *Silk al-durar fī a'yān al-qarn al-thānī 'ashar*. 4 vols. Cairo: Dār al-Ṭibā'a al-Kubrā, 1874–1883.
- Rawḍat al-madāris al-misriya*.
An important cultural journal of the last half of the nineteenth century.
- Sezgin, Fuat. *Geschichte des Arabischen Schrifttums*. Leiden: Brill, 1967.
- Al-Shalabī, Da'ūd. *Makḥṭūṭāt al-Mawsil*. Baghdad: Euphrates Press, 1927.
- Al-Shaṭṭī, Muḥammad Jamīl. *Rawḍ al-bashar fī a'yān Dimashq fī'l-qarn al-thālith 'ashar*. Damascus: Dār al-Yaqza al-'Arabiya li'l-ta'līf wa'l-tarjama wa'l-nashr, 1946.
- Al-Shūrbajī, Jamāl al-dīn. *Qā'ima bi awā'il al-maṭbū'at al-'arabiya al-mahfūza bi Dār al-Kutub*. Cairo: Dār al-Kutub, 1963.
- Among the most useful reference works for cultural history of the period from 1800 to 1850.
- Al-Ziriklī, Khayr al-dīn. *Al-A'lām*. 3 vols. Cairo, 1928.

Unpublished Materials

ARABIC

- Al-Alūsī, Shihāb al-dīn Maḥmūd. "Al-Ṣadiḥ bi shahīq al-nujūm 'alā afnān tarjamat Shaykh al-Islām wa Walī al-Ni'am." Manuscript. Al-Azhar, Cairo. 724 al-Tārīkh, Abāza.
- Al-Aṭṭār, Muḥammad. "Sharḥ 'alā manzūmat al-'Aṭṭār fī'l-tashrīḥ," 1813/1228. Manuscript. Al-Azhar, Cairo. 6509 Abāza.
- Al-'Awad, al-Ḥasan al-Badrī. "Al-Lawā'ih al-anwārīya." Manuscript. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo. 1419 Adab.
- Card File (Sijillāt) of Arabic Manuscripts in Istanbul. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo.
Lists the contents of twenty-eight mosque libraries in Istanbul.
- Al-Dimardāsh, Amīr Aḥmad. "Kitāb al-durra al-muṣāna' fī akhbār al-kināna-min mā waqa'a fī dawlat al-mamalik min al-sanājiq wa'l-dawla wa 'awā'idihim wa'l-bāshā." 2 vols. Manuscript. British Museum, London. No. 488 Arabic Manuscripts.
- Al-Ḥusaynī, Aḥmad. "Sharḥ al-umm al-musammā bi murshid al-anām li birr umm al-imām." Manuscript. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo. 1411 al-Tārīkh, Taymūr.
- Al-Majrīd, 'Abdullah b. al-'Arīf billāh Shaykh 'Alī al-'Adawī. "Hadhihi risālat al-tabshīr fī faḍl man banī masjidān aw farrashu bi'l-ḥaṣīr," 1844. Manuscript. Al-Azhar, Cairo. 430 Majāmi', no. 3.
- Al-Sijā'i, Aḥmad. "Al-Ruwḥ al-naḍīra fī mā yata'allāq bi'l-bayt al-bashīr al-nadhīr." Manuscript. Al-Azhar, Cairo. Majāmi' 430, no. 3.
- al-Zabīdī, Muḥammad Murṭaḍā. "Tuḥfat al-qamā'il fī madīḥ Shaykh al-'Arab Isma'il," 1770/1184. Manuscript. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo. 616 Taymūr Adab, 1770/1184.

EUROPEAN LANGUAGES

- Algar, Hamid. "Shaykh Muḥammad As'ad and the Naqshbandī Ṭarīqat in the Turkish Republic." Report. Middle East Studies Association of North America, Conference no. 5, 1971.
- Darwish, 'Abdullah 'Abd al-Fattāh. "Al-Khalīl Ibn Aḥmad and the Evolution of Arabic Lexicography." Doctoral dissertation, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, 1955.
- Digby, Simon. "Changing Horizons of Thought in Eighteenth-Century Muslim India." Conference paper. Colloquium on the Muslim World in the Eighteenth Century, Philadelphia, 1971.
- Great Britain. Public Record Office. Foreign Office, Egypt, Series 142, vol. I (1805).
- Kuhnke, Laverne. "Resistance and Response to Modernization: Preventive Medicine and Social Control in Egypt, 1825–1850." Doctoral dissertation, History Department, University of Chicago, March 1971.
- Marsot, Afaf Lutfi al-Sayyid. "The Role of the 'Ulama' through the Nineteenth Century." Conference paper. American University in Cairo—Columbia University Conference, Cairo, 1968.
- A pioneering article on the 'ulama' of Egypt.
- Moriah, Gabriel. "The Social Structure of the Ṣūfī Associations in Egypt in the Eighteenth Century." Doctoral dissertation, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, 1963.
- Verdery, Richard. "'Abd al-Raḥman al-Jabartī as a Source for the Early History of Muḥammad 'Alī, 1807–1821." Doctoral dissertation, Oriental Studies, Princeton University, 1967.
- Walz, Terence. "The Trade between Egypt and Bilād As-Sūdān." Doctoral dissertation, History Department, Boston University, 1974.

Published Materials

ARABIC

- 'Abd al-Karīm, Aḥmad 'Izzat. *Ta'rīkh al-ta'ālīm fī aṣr Muḥammad 'Alī*. Cairo: Maktabat al-Nahḍa al-Miṣrīya, 1928.
- 'Abd al-Raḥīm, 'Abd al-Raḥman 'A. *Al-Dawla al-su'ūdīya al-ūla*. Cairo, 1969.
- The most detailed study of the rise of the Wahhābīs.
- . "Dirāsa nuṣṣīya li'l-kitāb hazz al-quḥūf fī sharḥ qaṣīdat Abī Shadūf." *Al-Majalla al-Miṣrīya li'l-Dirāsāt al-Ta'rīkhīya* 20 (1973): 287–316.
- A study of a literary source for the study of the Egyptian countryside in the seventeenth century.
- . *Al-Rif al-Miṣrī fī'l-qarn al-thāmin 'ashar*. Cairo, 1972.
- 'Abd al-Salām, Ḥasan. *Dhakīrat al-'Aṭṭār aw tadhkīrat Da'ūd fī riwayatihi fī 'ilm al-ḥadīth*. Cairo, 1947.
- 'Abduh, Ibrāhīm. *Ta'rīkh al-Waqā'i' al-Miṣrīya*. Cairo: al-Maṭba'a al-Amīriya, 1942.
- Al-'Allāf, 'Abd al-Karīm. *Al-Tarab 'inda-l-'arab*. Baghdad: Maṭba'at As'ad, 1963.
- One of the few works containing material on Arabic music in the later Middle Ages.

Al-ʿĀmilī, Muḥammad Bahā' ad-dīn. *Kashkūl*. Cairo: Maṭba'at al-ʿĀmira al-Ḥamīdiyya al-Miṣriyya, 1916.

Al-Amīr, Muḥammad. *Ḥāshiyā ʿalā sharḥ ʿAbd al-Salām li jawharat al-tawḥīd liʾl-Laḡānī*. Cairo: Muṣṭafā al-Bābā al-Ḥalabī, 1948.

———. *Ḥāshiyā ʿalā sharḥ matn mughnī al-labīb*. Cairo: al-Maṭbaʿa al-Sharqiyya, 1874/1299.

———. *Ḥāshiyat al-Amīr ʿalā sharḥ al-azharīya*. Cairo: al-Maṭbaʿat al-Amīriyya, 1869/1286.

———. *Sharḥ majmūʿ Muḥammad al-Amīr*. 2 vols. Cairo: al-Maṭbaʿa al-Khayriyya, 1884/1302.

Among the most influential works on Mālikī *fiqh* until the early twentieth century.

Anīs, Muḥammad. "Ḥaqaʿiq ʿan ʿAbd al-Raḥman al-Jabartī." *Al-Majalla*. *al-Taʾrīkhīya* 9 (1962): 66–115.

ʿĀnūtī, Usāma. *Al-Ḥarakat al-adabīya fiʾl-Shām fiʾl-qarn al-thāmin ʿashar*. Beirut: St. Joseph University Press, 1971.

The first study of Syrian intellectual life in the eighteenth century.

Al-Bahī, Muḥammad. *Al-ʿIlmāniyya waʾl-Islām bayn al-fikr waʾl-taṭbīq*. Cairo: Dār al-Ṭibāʿa al-Muḥammadiyya, n.d.

Al-Bājūrī, Ibrāhīm. *Tuḥfat al-murīd ʿalā jawharat al-tawḥīd*. Cairo: Muṣṭafā al-Bābā al-Ḥalabī, 1939.

Al-Bakrī, Muṣṭafā. *Risāla fi radd ʿalā man ʿal-ziyāra li qubūr al-anbiyāʾ waʾl-awliyāʾ*. Cairo: Muṣṭafā al-Bābā al-Ḥalabī, 1932/1351.

Al-Bakrī, Tawfīq. *Bayt al-Sadāt*. Cairo, n.d.

The main source for the study of the *mashāyikh al-sajjāda* of the Wafāʿiyya.

———. *Bayt al-Ṣiddīq*. Cairo: Maṭbaʿat al-Muʿid, 1905–1906/1323.

The main source for the study of the *mashāyikh al-sajjāda* of the Bakriyya.

Al-Balīdī, Aḥmad. *Sharḥ al-Balīdī ʿalā al-maqālāt*. Cairo: al-Maṭbaʿa al-Khayriyya, 1910.

An example of eighteenth-century science in Egypt.

Al-Dajjānī, Aḥmad Ṣidqī. *Al-Ḥaraka al-ṣānūsiyya nashʾatuḥā wa numūʾuhā fiʾl-qarn al-tāsī ʿashar*. Beirut: Dār al-Lubnān liʾl-Ṭibāʿa waʾl-Nashr, 1967.

Compare to the older work by Muḥammad Fūʾād Shukrī, which is much more difficult to obtain.

Al-Darwīsh, ʿAlī Efendī. *Al-Ishʿār bi ḥamīd al-ashʿār*. Cairo, 1855.

Al-Disūqī, ʿUmar. *Fiʾl-adab al-ḥadīth*. 2 vols. Cairo: Maṭbaʿat Lajnat al-Bayān al-ʿArabi, 1954.

Fahmī, Naʿīm Zakī. *Ṭuruq al-tijāra al-duwāliyya wa maḥaṭṭātuhā bayn al-sharq waʾl-gharb*. Cairo: al-Hayʾa al-Miṣriyya, 1973.

Ghaliunji, Paul. *Ibn al-Nafīs*. Cairo: al-Dār al-Miṣriyya liʾl-Taʾlīf waʾl-Nashr, n.d.

Ḥamīd, Rāʾūf ʿAbbās. *Al-Niẓām al-ijtimāʿī fi Miṣr fi ḥill al-milkiyya al-zirāʿiyya al-kabīra*, 1837–1914. Cairo: Dār al-Fikr al-Ḥadīth liʾl-Ṭibāʿa waʾl-Nashr, 1973.

A socioeconomic analysis drawing on archival materials.

Ḥasan, Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Ghanī. *Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār*. Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif, 1968.

The first and only book on Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār. It is especially useful for the poetry of al-ʿAṭṭār, which it reprints. The author is himself a poet.

Al-Ḥifnāwī, Muḥammad b. Salīm. *Al-Thamāra al-baḥiyya fiʾl-ṣaḥāba al-badriyya*. Introduction by Muṣṭafā ʿAbd al-Rāziq. Cairo: Maṭbaʿat al-Anwār, 1945.

Al-Ḥulwānī, Aḥmad. *Al-Sumūw al-rūḥī fiʾl-adab al-ṣūfī*. Cairo: Muṣṭafā al-Bābā al-Ḥalabī, 1948.

A very useful work for identifying the influence of mystical thought in modern Egyptian poetry.

Ibn 'Arabi, Muḥyi ad-dīn. *Al-Futūḥāt al-Makkiya*. Beirut: Dār al-Ṣādir, 1968.

Ibn Su'ūd, 'Abd al-Salām. *Dalīl mu'arrikh al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā*. Ribāṭ: Dār al-Kitāb, n.d.

Al-Jabartī, 'Abd al-Raḥman. *'Aja'ib al-athār fī l-tarājim wa' l-akhbār*. 4 vols. Cairo: Būlāq, 1879.

See also the French translation, *Merveilles biographiques et historiques*. 9 vols. Cairo, 1888–1898.

———. *Mazhar al-taqdis fī dhahāb dawlat al-faransīs*. Cairo: Lajnat al-Bayān al-'Arabi, 1969.

Karāma, Buṭrus. *Saj' al-ḥamāma aw diwān al-maghfār lahu al-mu'allim Buṭrus Karāma*. Istanbul: Maṭba'at al-Jawā'ib, 1886.

Al-Khashshāb, Isma'īl. *Diwān al-Khashshāb*. Istanbul: Maṭba'at al-Jawā'ib, 1884.

An important literary work of the early nineteenth century. The poems to al-Zabidī form the most important part.

Khayret Efendi. *Riyāḍ al-kutabā' wa ḥiyāḍ al-udabā'*. Cairo: Būlāq, 1878.

Kilāni, Muḥammad Sayyid. *Al-Adab al-Miṣri fī zill al-ḥukm al-'Uthmānī*. Cairo: Dār al-Qawmiya al-'Arabiya li'l-Ṭibā'a, 1965.

The first important study of the literature of Ottoman Egypt.

———. *Fī rubū' al-Azbakiya: Dirāsa adabiya, ta'rīkhīya, ijtīmā'īya*. Cairo: Dār al-'Arab, 1958–1959.

An excellent short work on the social history of literature, focusing on the famous suburb of al-Azbakiya in Cairo.

Kratchkowski, Ignatius. *Ḥayat Muḥammad 'Iyād al-Ṭanṭāwī*. Cairo: al-Majlis al-A'lā li Ri'āyat al-Funūn wa'l-Ādāb, 1964.

Al-Madani, Muḥammad Zāfir. *Al-Nūr al-sāṭi' wa' l-burhān al-qāṭi'*. Cairo: 1883.

Al-Maghribi, Isma'īl 'Abdullah. *Kitāb nūr al-waḍ' fī manāqib wa karāmāt 'umdat al-awliya'*. Cairo: Maṭba'at al-Ṣādiq al-Khayriya, 1928.

Mahmūd, 'Alī b. al-Khalwatī. *Hadhā minḥat al-majīd 'alā sayf al-murīd*. Cairo: al-Maṭba'a al-Ḥusayniya, 1911.

Al-Majdi, Ṣāliḥ. *Ḥilyat al-zamān bi manāqib khādim al-waṭan, sirat Rifā'a Rafī'i al-Ṭaḥṭāwī*. Cairo: Muṣṭafā al-Bābā al-Ḥalabī, 1958.

Al-Ma'lūf, 'Isā Iskandar. *Al-Uṣra al-'arabiya al-mushthara bi'l-tibb al-'arabiya wa ashhara al-makhtūṭāt al-tibbiya al-'arabiya*. Beirut: al-Maṭba'a al-Adabiya, 1935.

Mandūr, Muḥammad. *Al-Naqd wa' l-nuqqād al-mu'aṣirīn*. Cairo: Maṭba'a Miṣr, n.d.

Al-Marṣaṭi, Husayn. *Al-Kalim al-thamān*. Cairo: Maṭba'at al-Jumhūriya, 1903..

———. *Al-Waṣṣla al-adabiya*. 2 vols. Cairo: Maṭba'at al-Madāris al-Mālikiya, 1877.

Mubārak, 'Alī. *Ālām al-dīn*. 4 vols. Alexandria, 1299.

———. *Al-Khiṭaṭ al-tawfiqiya al-jadida*. Vols. I–XX. Cairo: al-Maṭba'a al-Kubrā, 1886–1888.

Mursī, Ṣāliḥ. "Thawrat al-'umyān." *Al-Hilāl* 78 (1970): 76–84.

Al-Nashshār 'Alī Sāmī. *Manāḥij al-baḥth 'inda mufakkiri al-Islām wa naqd al-Muslimīn li'l-mantiq al-Aristū*. Cairo: Dār al-Fikr al-'Arabi, 1947.

Qasṭūn, Wadī' 'Abdullah. *Al-Afrānī fī Ḥalab fī l-qarn al-thāmin 'ashar*. Aleppo: Maṭba'at al-Dād, 1968.

Al-Rāfi'i, 'Abd al-Raḥman. *Shu'arā' al-waṭaniya, tarājimuhum wa shi'ruhum al-waṭani*. Cairo: Maktabat al-Nahḍa al-Miṣriya, 1954.

- Ramaḍān, 'Abd al-Jawwād. "Bayn al-'Aṭṭār wa'l-Khashshāb min udabā' al-qarn al-tāsi' 'ashar." *Majallat al-Azhar* 19 (1948): 139–144, 220–225.
- Al-Rashīdī, Aḥmad Ḥasan. *Bahjat al-ru'asā' fi 'laj amrāq al-nisā'*. Cairo: Būlāq, 1845.
- One of many early texts in medicine, an area which has yet to be studied.
- Al-Riḍwān, Abū'l-Futūḥ. *Ta'rīkh maṭba'at Būlāq*. Cairo: al-Maṭba'a al-Amīriyya, 1953.
- Ritter, Helmut, ed. *Asrār al-balāgha (The Mysteries of Eloquence of 'Abd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī)*. Istanbul: Istanbul Government Press, 1954.
- Al-Ṣabbān, Muḥammad. *Ḥāshiya 'alā sharḥ Mullā Ḥanafī 'alā al-adab al-aḥudiya*. Cairo: al-Maṭba'a al-Zāhira, 1908.
- . *Ḥāshiyat al-Ṣabbān 'alā sharḥ al-Ashmūnī 'alā alfiyat Ibn Malik*. 2 vols. Cairo: Maṭba'at al-Sa'āda, 1924.
- This was a major grammar text of the eighteenth century used in al-Azhar until the twentieth century.
- . *Kitāb is'āf al-rāghibīn fi strat al-Muṣṭafā wa faḍā'il ahl al-bayt*. Cairo: al-Maṭba'a al-Azhariyya, 1929.
- Al-Ṣā'idī, 'Abd al-Muta'āl. *Ta'rīkh al-iṣlāḥ fi l-Azhar*. Cairo, 1947.
- Salām, Muṣṭafā Yūsuf al-Shādhilī. *Jawāhir al-iṭtilā' wa durr al-intifā' 'alā matn Ibn Shajā'*. Cairo: al-Taḍamun al-Ikhwī Ḥafīz Muḥammad Dā'ud, 1931.
- This work contains the texts of 'Alī al-Bayyūmī.
- Sāmī, Amīn. *Taqwīm al-Nil*. 2 vols. Cairo, 1928.
- Al-Sānūsī, Muḥammad. *Shifā' al-ṣadr bi āra' al-masā'il al-'ashar*. Cairo: Dār al-Ma'arīf, 1966.
- Al-Sharqāwī, 'Abdullah. *Faṭḥ al-mubdī bi sharḥ mukhtaṣar al-Zabīdī*. Cairo: Muṣṭafā al-Bābā al-Ḥalabī, 1955.
- A major work of the post-Napoleonic period in ḥadīth. Useful for research in a wide range of fields, including economy and medicine.
- . *Tuḥfat al-nāzirīn fi man wāliya Miṣr min al-mulūk wa-l-salātīn*. Cairo, 1996.
- Shaybūb, Khalīl. *'Abd al-Raḥman al-Jabartī*. Cairo: Dār al-Ma'arīf, 1948.
- The outstanding work on the cultural context of al-Jabartī.
- Al-Shayyāl, Jamāl al-dīn. *Al-Ḥarakāt al-iṣlāhiyya wa marakiz al-thaqāfa*. 2 vols. Cairo: Arab League, 1958.
- . *Ta'rīkh al-tarjama wa'l-ḥarakat al-thaqāfiyya fi 'aṣr Muḥammad 'Alī*. Cairo: Maṭba'at al-I'timād, 1951.
- . *Al-Ta'rīkh wa'l-mu'arrikhūn fi Miṣr*. Cairo: Maktabat al-Nahḍa al-Miṣriyya, 1958.
- An English translation is *A History of Egyptian Historiography in the Nineteenth Century*. Alexandria: Alexandria University Press, 1962.
- Shihāb al-dīn, Muḥammad. *Diwān Muḥammad Shihāb al-dīn*. Cairo: Muḥammad Shāhīn, 1860/1277.
- Al-Shubrāwī, 'Abdullah. *Al-Itḥāf bi ḥubb al-ashraf*. Cairo: Muṣṭafā al-Bābā al-Ḥalabī, 1900.
- Shukrī, Muḥammad Fū'ād. *Al-Sānūsiya, dīn wa dawla*. Cairo: Dār al-Fikr al-'Arabī, 1948.
- Al-Taftāzānī, Abū'l-Wafā' al-Ghunaymī. "Al-Turuq al-ṣūfiyya fi Miṣr." *Hawliyyāt Kulliyat al-Ādab* 25 (1963): 55–85.
- Al-Taḥṭāwī, Rifā'a. *Al-Kunūz al-Mukhtār fi kashf al-arāḍi wa'l-bihār*. Cairo: Maktabat al-Ṭubḥiyya, 1835.
- This is perhaps the first sustained presentation of the Copernican theory in the Arab world.

- . *Bidayat al-quḍamā'*. Cairo: Būlāq, 1838.
- . *Manahij al-albab al-miṣriyya fī mabāhiḡ al-adab al-‘aṣriyya*. Cairo: Maṭba‘at Sharikat al-Raghā’ib, 1912/1330.
- . *Nihayat al-‘ijāz fī strāt sākin al-Ḥijāz*. Cairo: Maṭba‘at al-Madāris al-Mālikiyya, 1876.
- A work of equal importance for sociology as the author's *Manahij*.
- . *Takhlīṣ al-ibrīz fī talkhīṣ Bārīz*. Cairo: Muṣṭafā al-Bābā al-Ḥalabī, 1958.
- Taymūr, Aḥmad, ed. *A‘lām al-fikr al-islāmī fī l-‘aṣr al-ḥadīth*. Cairo: al-Lajna al-Taymūriyya, 1967.
- Tizīnī, Ṭīb. *Mashrū‘ ru‘ya jadīda ilā al-fikr al-‘arabī*. Damascus: Dār Dimashq, 1971.
- A major study of the history of Arabic philosophy which appears to follow the "Frankfurt School."
- Ṭūsūn, ‘Umar. *Al-Ba‘ṡhāt al-‘ilmīyya fī ‘ahd Muḥammad ‘Alī*. Alexandria: Maṭba‘a Ṣalāḥ al-dīn, 1934.
- Walī‘ullāh, Shāh. *Ḥujjat allāh al-bāliḡa*. Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-Ḥadītha, n.d.
- Al-Waqā‘i‘ al-Miṣriyya*. Cairo. 1828—.
- The official newspaper, published irregularly in the early years.
- Al-Zabīdī, Muḥammad Murtaḍā. *Ḥikmat al-ishraq ilā kuttāb al-afaq*, 1770/1184.
- Edited by ‘Abd al-Salām Ḥārūn. Baghdad: Maktabat al-Mathāna, 1954.
- . *Itḥāf al-sādāt al-muttiqīn bi sharḥ asrār ihya‘ ‘ulūm al-dīn*. 12 vols. Cairo: al-Maṭba‘a al-Maymaniyya, 1893/1311.
- . *Tāj al-‘arūs min sharḥ jawāhir al-qāmūs*. 10 vols. Baṅghāzī: Dār Libīyya li l-Nashr wa l-Tawzī‘, n.d.
- This should be taken with al-Jabartī's *‘Ajā’ib* as one of the two major sources for eighteenth-century Egyptian culture. It is a prodigious work of scholarship, far exceeding the bounds of lexicography.
- Al-Zayyātī, Abū l-Qāsim. *Al-Turjumān al-kubrā*. Ribāṭ: Wizārat al-Anbā’, 1967.

EUROPEAN LANGUAGES

- Abdel-Malek, Anouar. *Idéologie et renaissance nationale de l’Egypte moderne*. Paris: Editions Anthropos, 1969.
- Abdесселем, Ahmed. *Les historiens tunisiens des XVII^e, XVIII^e, et XIX^e siècles: Essai d’histoire culturelle*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1973.
- Abdulhak, Adnan. *La Science chez les Turcs ottomans*. Paris: Maisonneuve, 1939.
- Abir, M. "The ‘Arab Rebellion’ of Amīr Ghālib of Mecca, 1788–1813." *Middle East Studies* 5 (1972): 191–220.
- Amin, Samir. *Accumulation on a World Scale: A Critique of the Theory of Underdevelopment*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974.
- Ayalon, David. "Studies in al-Jabartī, I: Notes on the Transformation of Mamlūk Society in Egypt under the Ottomans." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 3 (1960): 148–174, 275–325.
- Badawi, M. M. "Al-Bārūdī, Precursor of the Modern Arabic Poetic Revival." *Der Welt des Islams* 22 (1969): 228–244.
- Baer, Gabriel. "Urbanization in Egypt, 1820–1907." In *The Beginnings of Modernization in the Middle East in the Nineteenth Century*, edited by W. R. Polk and R. L. Chambers, pp. 155–171. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

- Baldwin, George. *Memorial Relating to the Trade in Slaves*. Alexandria, 1789.
- Bannerth, Ernst. "La Khalwatiyya en Egypte." *Mélanges Institut Dominicains Etudes Orientales* 8 (1964-1966): 1-75.
- Bergeron, L., ed. *L'Ankylose de l'économie Méditerranéenne au XVIIIème et au début du XIXème siècles: Le rôle de l'agriculture*. Nice: Centre de la Méditerranée Moderne et Contemporaine, 1973.
- Berkes, Niyazi. *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*. Montreal: McGill University Press, 1964.
- Bianchi, T.-X. *Notice sur un ouvrage d'anatomie et de médecine*. Paris: L.-T. Cellat, 1821.
- . "Recueil de Fetvas." *Journal Asiatique* 1st ser., 2 (1822): 3-16.
- Birge, John Kingley. *The Bektashi Order of Dervishes*. Hartford: Hartford Connecticut Seminary, 1937.
- Bombaci, Alessio. *Histoire de la littérature turque*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1968.
- Bosworth, C. E. "A Maqāma on Secretaryship: Al-Qalqashandī's *Al-Kawākib al-durriyya fī manāqib al-badriyya*." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 27 (1964): 291-299.
- Brown, John P. *The Dervishes or Oriental Spiritualism*. London: Trubner and Company, 1868.
- Burckhardt, John. *Arabic Proverbs, or the Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1875.
- . *Notes on Bedouins and Wahabys*. London: Henry Coulbourn and Richard Bentley, 1830.
- . *Travels in Arabia*. Reprint, London: Cass, 1968.
- C.-D., N. "L'Aristocratie religieuse en Egypte." *Revue du Monde Musulmane* 2 (1908): 241-283.
- This article deals with the Wafā'iyya and the Bakriyya.
- Cachia, Pierre. *Ṭaha Husayn: His Place in the Egyptian Literary Renaissance*. London: Luzacs and Company, 1956.
- Capper, James. *Observations on the Passage to India through Egypt*. London: Faden, 1785.
- Charles-Roux, François. *Bonaparte, gouverneur de l'Egypte*. Paris: Plon, 1935.
- . *Les Origines de l'expédition de l'Egypte*. Paris: Plon, 1910.
- Le Chatelier, A. *Les Confréries musulmanes du Hedjaz*. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1887.
- Chejne, Anwar. *The Arabic Language: Its Role in History*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1969.
- Choiseul-Gouffier, L. P. *La France en l'Orient sous Louis XVI*. Paris: Alphonse Piscard, 1887.
- Colloque Internationale sur l'Histoire du Caire*. Cairo: Ministry of Culture, 1972.
- Copies of Original Letters from the Army of General Bonaparte in Egypt*. London: J. Wright, 1798.
- Daressy, M. G. "Les maladies fréquentes au Caire au XVII^e siècle." *Bulletin de l'Institut de l'Egypte* 5 (1923): 67-82.
- Demeerseman, A. "Une mémoire célèbre qui préfigure l'évolution moderne en Islam." [*Bulletin de l'Institut des Belles Lettres Arabes* 18 (1955): 5-33.
- Dény, J. "Quatre lettres de Mehmet Ali de l'Egypte." In *Mélanges offerts à Wm. Marçais*, pp. 125-146. Paris: Maisonneuve, 1950.
- . *Le Sommaire des archives turques au Caire*. Cairo: La Société Royale de Géographie de l'Egypte, 1930.

- Depont, Octave, and X. Copolani. *Les Confréries religieuses musulmanes*. Algiers, 1897.
- Description de l'Égypte—Etat Moderne*. 4 vols. Paris, 1809–1812.
- Dodwell, Henry. *The Founder of Modern Egypt*. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1967.
- Douin, G. "Le Carrosse de Mohamed Bey." *Bulletin de l'Institut de l'Égypte* 8 (1926): 165–184.
- Elgood, Cyril. "Medicine of the Prophet." *Osiris* 14 (1962): 33–192.
The main source on al-Suyūṭī's medicine.
- Farhat, Germanos. *Dictionnaire arabe*. Marseilles: Imprimerie Carnaud, 1849.
- Fazlur-Rahman, I. *Islamic Methodology in History*. Karachi: Central Institute of Islamic Research, 1965.
- Forbin, Count de. *Travels in Egypt, Being a Continuation of Travels in the Holy Land*. London: Sir Richard Philipps and Company, 1819.
- Foucault, Michel. *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. New York: Random House, 1973.
- Frank, A. G. *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America*. New York: Modern Reader, 1969.
- Gibb, H. A. R. "Studies in Contemporary Arabic Literature, IV: The Egyptian Novel." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 7 (1933–1935): 1–22.
- Gibb, Sir Hamilton, and Harold Bowen. *Islamic Society and the West*. Vol. I, parts 1 and 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1950.
- Goldmann, Lucien. *Immanuel Kant*. London: NLB, 1971.
- . *The Philosophy of the Enlightenment*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973.
- Goldziher, Ignace. *Muhammadian Studies*. Edited by S. M. Stem. 2 vols. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1971.
- Guémard, Gabriel. *Aventuriers Mamluk de l'Égypte*. Alexandria: Société Royale d'Archaeologie d'Alexandrie, 1928.
- . "Les Auxiliaires de l'armée de Bonaparte." *Bulletin de l'Institut de l'Égypte* 9 (1926): 1–17.
- . "De l'Armement et de l'équipement des Mamelouks." *Bulletin de l'Institut de l'Égypte* 8 (1926): 1–19.
- . "Essai d'histoire de l'Institut de l'Égypte." *Bulletin de l'Institut de l'Égypte* 6 (1924): 43–84.
- . *Histoire et bibliographie critique de la Commission de Science et Arts de l'Institut de l'Égypte*. Cairo: Paul Barbey, 1936.
- . "Trois témoins de la campagne de l'Égypte, Lascaris et Corancel en Syrie, Jaubert en Perse et le rêve Oriental de Bonaparte." *Bulletin de l'Institut de l'Égypte* 7 (1925): 9–31.
- . *Une Oeuvre française: Les réformes en l'Égypte d'Ali Bey el-Kebir à Mehemet 'Ali, 1760–1848*. Cairo: Paul Barbey, 1936.
- Gupta, Ashin Das. "Trade and Politics in the Eighteenth Century in India." In *Islam and the Trade of Asia*, edited by D. S. Richards, pp. 181–215. Oxford: Bruno Cassirer, 1970.
- Gurvitch, Georges. *The Social Frameworks of Knowledge*. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.
- Guys, Henri. *Esquisse de l'état politique et commerciale de la Syrie*. Paris: Chez France, 1862.

- Haddad, Robert. *Syrian Christians in Muslim Society*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970.
- Hamont, P.-N. *L'Égypte sous Mehmet Ali*. 2 vols. Paris: Leautey et Lecoigne, 1843.
- Hasluck, F. W. *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929.
- Hayyim, J. Cohen. "The Economic Background and the Secular Occupations of Muslim Jurisprudents and Traditionalists in the Classical Period of Islam until the Middle of the Eleventh Century." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 13 (1970): 16–61.
- Heyd, Uriel. "The Ottoman Ulema and Westernization in the Time of Selim III and Mahmud II." In *Studies in Islamic History and Civilization*, pp. 48–104. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1961.
- Heyworth-Dunne, J. "Arabic Literature in Egypt in the Eighteenth Century with Some Reference to the Poetry and the Poets." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 9 (1937–1939): 675–689.
- . *Introduction to the History of Education in Modern Egypt*. London: Cass, 1967.
- . "Rifā'ah Badawī Rāfi'ī al-Taḥṭāwī: The Egyptian Revivalist." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 10 (1940–1942): 399–415.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. *The Age of Revolution*. Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1962.
- . "The Crisis of the Seventeenth Century." In *Crisis in Europe*, edited by Trevor Ashton, pp. 5–58. New York: Doubleday Press, 1967.
- Holt, Peter M. "Al-Jabartī's Introduction to the History of Ottoman Egypt." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 25 (1962): 38–52.
- , ed. *Political and Social Change in Modern Egypt*. London: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- Hopwood, Derek. *The Russian Presence in Syria and Palestine, 1843–1914*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.
- Ibn Khaldūn. *The Muqaddimah*. Edited by Franz Rosenthal. 3 vols. New York: Bollingen Foundation, 1958.
- Issa, Hossam. *Capitalisme et sociétés anonymes en l'Égypte*. Paris: R. Pichon et R. Durand-Auzias, 1970.
- Issawi, Charles. *The Economic History of the Middle East, 1800–1914*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.
- Jargy, Simon. *La Musique arabe*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1971.
- Juynboll, G. H. A. *The Authenticity of the Tradition Literature—Discussions in Modern Egypt*. Leyden: Brill, 1969.
- Khalifa, Ḥājī. *The Balance of Truth*, by Katib Chelebi. Translated by G. L. Lewis. London: Allen and Unwin, 1957.
- Kissling, Hans Joachim. "Aus der Geschichte des Chelvetijje-Ordens." *Zeitschrift der Deutsches Morgenländer Gesellschaft* 103 (1953): 233–289.
- Kopf, L. "Religious Influences on Mediaeval Arabic Philology." *Studia Islamica* 5 (1956): 33–59.
- Lampton, Ann K. S. "Persian Trade under the Early Qajars." In *Islam and the Trade of Asia*, edited by D. S. Richards, pp. 215–244. Oxford: Bruno Cassirer, 1970.
- Landau, Rom. *The Philosophy of Ibn al-'Arabī*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1959.
- Landberg, Carlo Von. *Primeurs Arabes*. Leiden: Brill, 1886.
- Lane, Edward W. *Arabic-English Lexicon*. 9 vols. London: Williams and Norgate, 1863.

- . *The Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*. Reissue, London: J. M. Dent, 1963.
- . *A Thousand and One Nights*. 3 vols. London: C. Knight and Company, 1839–1841.
- Laoust, Henri. *Contribution à une étude de la méthodologie canonique de Taqī al-dīn Aḥmad b. Taimīya*. Cairo: Imprimerie de l'Institut Français d'Archaeologie Orientale, 1939.
- . *Essai sur les doctrines sociales et politiques de Taqī al-dīn Aḥmad b. Taimīya*. Cairo: Imprimerie de l'Institut Français d'Archaeologie Orientale, 1939.
- Larousse, Pierre. *Grand dictionnaire universel du XIX siècle*. Paris: Administration du grand dictionnaire universel, 1875.
- Levey, M. *The Medical Formulary of al-Samarqandī*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1967.
- Livingston, John W. "Ali Bey al-Kabīr and the Jews." *Middle East Studies* 7 (May 1971): 221–229.
- . "The Rise of Shaykh al-Balad 'Alī Bey al-Kabīr: A Study of the Accuracy of the Chronicle of al-Jabartī." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 33 (1970): 283–294.
- Lukacs, George. *History and Class Consciousness*. Cambridge, Mass.: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1972.
- Lusignan. *A History of the Revolt of Ali Bey against the Ottoman Porte*. London, 1784.
- Madkour, Ibrāhīm. *L'Organon d'Aristote dans le monde arabe*. Paris: J. Vrin, 1969.
- Marcel, Jean-Joseph. *Contes du Cheykh el-Mahdy, traduite de l'arabe*. 3 vols. 2d ed. Paris, 1835.
- A literary work of the early nineteenth century which has not yet been studied.
- Marsot, Afaf Lutfī al-Sayyid. "The Political and Economic Functions of the 'Ulamā' in the 18th Century." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 16 (1973): 130–154.
- . "The Role of the 'Ulamā' in Egypt during the Early Nineteenth Century." In *Social Change in Modern Egypt*, edited by P. M. Holt, pp. 264–280. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968.
- Martin, B. G. "Notes sur l'origine de la ṭarīqa des Tijānīya et sur le début d'al-Hājj 'Umar." *Revue des Etudes Islamiques* 37 (1969): 267–290.
- . "A Short History of the Khalwatiya Order of the Derviches." In *Scholars, Saints and Sufis*, edited by Nikki R. Keddie, pp. 275–307. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.
- Masson, P. *La Histoire du commerce français dans le Levant au XVIII^e siècle*. Paris: Hachette, 1911.
- Mémoires sur l'Égypte publiées pendant les campagnes du General Bonaparte*. 4 vols. Paris, 1797–1801.
- A partial English translation is *Memoirs Relative to Egypt*. 2 vols. London: N. R. Philipps, 1800.
- Meyerhof, Max. "Sur le nom Dardar (orme et frêne) chez les Arabes." *Bulletin de l'Institut de l'Égypte* 18 (1935–1936): 137–149.
- Molé, Marijan. "Les Kubrawīya entre Sunnisme et Shī'isme aux huitième et neuvième siècles de l'hégire." *Revue des Etudes Islamiques* 29 (1961): 61–142.
- . *Les mystiques musulmanes*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1965.
- Moore, Barrington, Jr. *The Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1966.

- Moosa, Matti. "Napoleon's Islamic Policy in Egypt." *Islamic Quarterly* 9 (1965): 103–116.
- Moreh, S. "Blank Verse (al-Shi'r al-Mursal) in Modern Arabic Literature." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 29 (1966): 483–506.
- . "Reputed Autographs of 'Abd al-Rahman al-Jabarti and Related Problems." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 28 (1965): 524–540.
- El-Mouelhy, Ibrāhīm. "L'Enregistrement de la propriété en l'Égypte durant l'occupation française." *Bulletin de l'Institut de l'Égypte* 30 (1949): 197–228.
- Nasr, Seyyid Hossein. *An Introduction to Islamic Cosmological Doctrines*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964.
- . *Islamic Studies*. Beirut: Librairie du Liban, 1967.
- . *Science and Civilization in Islam*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- Nizami, K. A. "Naqshbandi Influence on Mughal Rulers and Politics." *Islamic Culture* 39 (1965): 41–52.
- North, Douglas C., and Robert Paul Thomas. *The Rise of the Western World*. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1973.
- Olivier, G. A. *Voyage dans l'empire Othman*. Vols. I and II. Paris: Chez Henri Agasse, 1804.
- Owen, E. R. J. *Cotton and the Egyptian Economy, 1820–1914*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.
- Pallary, Paul. "Les Rapports Originaux de Larrey à l'armée d'Orient." *Mémoires de l'Institut de l'Égypt* 30 (1936): 1–85.
- Palmer, R. R. *Twelve Who Ruled*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1941.
- Pérès, Henri. "L'Institut de l'Égypte et l'oeuvre de Bonaparte jugés par deux historiens Arabes contemporains." *Arabica* 4 (1957): 113–130.
- Peters, F. E. *Aristotle and the Arabs*. New York: New York University Press, 1968.
- Plessner, Martin. "Dā'ūd al-Anṭākī's Tenth Century Encyclopedia on Medicine, Natural History and Occult Sciences." In *Congrès d'Histoire des Sciences*. Vol. 10 (1962), pp. 635–637. Paris: Hermann, 1964.
- Politis, A. G. *L'Hellénisme et l'Égypte moderne*. Vols. I and II. Paris: Librairie Félix Alcan, 1929.
- A valuable source for late eighteenth-century Egypt.
- Pouqueville, F. C. H. L. *Voyage en Morée à Constantinople et en Albanie*. Paris: Chez Gabon et Cie., 1805.
- Prinsep, James. "Notes on the Nautical Instruments of the Arabs." In *Une Introduction à l'astronomie nautique Arabe*, edited by Gabriel Ferrand, pp. 1–30. Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1928.
- Rahbar, Dā'ūd. "Shāh Walī'ullah and Ijtihād: A Translation of Selected Passages from his 'Iqd al-Jid fi Ahkām al-Ijtihād wa'l-Taqlīd." *Muslim World* 45 (1955): 346–358.
- Raymond, André. *Artisans et commerçants au Caire au XVIII^{ème} siècle*. 2 vols. Damascus: IFAO, 1973–1974.
- . "Essai de géographie des quartiers de résidence aristocratique au Caire au XVIII^{ème} siècle." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 6 (1963): 58–103.
- . "Quartiers et mouvements populaires au Caire au XVIII^{ème} siècle." In *Political and Social Change in Modern Egypt*, edited by P. M. Holt, pp. 104–116. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968.
- . "Tunisiens et Maghrebins au Caire au dix-huitième siècle." *Les Cahiers de Tunisie* 7 (1959): 336–371.

- Reinaud, Joseph-Toussaint. "De la gazette arabe et turque imprimée en l'Égypte." *Journal Asiatique* 1st ser., 8 (1831): 238–249.
- . "Notice des ouvrages Arabes, Persans et Turcs imprimées en l'Égypte." *Journal Asiatique* 1st ser., 8 (1831): 333–344.
- Rescher, Nicholas. *The Development of Arabic Logic*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1964.
- Rescher, Oscar. *Orientalische Miszellen*. Constantinople, 1925.
- Rivlin, Helen. *The Agricultural Policy of Muḥammad 'Alī in Egypt*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1961.
- Rodinson, Maxime. *Islam et capitalisme*. Paris: Editions de Seuil, 1966.
An English translation is *Islam and Capitalism*, translated by Brian Pearce. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1978.
- Romano, Ruggiero. *Commerce et prix du blé à Marseilles au XVIII^{ème} siècle*. Paris: Colin, 1956.
- Rudé, Georges. *The Crowd in the French Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1959.
- Sacy, Sylvestre de. *Bibliothèque Imprimé*. Paris, 1843.
This library lists many rare items from the period of the author's life, supplementing al-Shūrbajī. There is a copy in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris.
- Saint-Martin, J. "Critique Littéraire." *Journal Asiatique* 1st ser., 1 (1822): 109–115.
- Saint-Simon, Claude Henri and Infantin. *Oeuvres de Saint-Simon et d'Infantin*. Paris: E. Dentu, 1873.
- Salāma, Ibrāhīm. *Bibliographie analytique et critique*. Cairo: Paul Barbey, 1938.
- . *Enseignement islamique en l'Égypte*. Cairo: Imprimerie Nationale, 1938.
Contains material not found elsewhere on cultural life for the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.
- Savant, Jean. *Les Mamelouks de Napoleon*. Paris: Calmann-Levy, 1949.
- Sayili, Aydin. "Islam and the Rise of the Seventeenth Century Science." *Türk Tarih Kurumu, Belleten* 22 (1958): 353–368.
- Schacht, Joseph. *Classicisme et déclin culturel dans l'histoire de l'Islam*. Paris: Editions Besson Chante-Merle, 1957.
- Scholch, Alexander. *Agypten den Agyptern: Die Politische und Gesellschaftliche Krise der Jahre 1878–1882 in Ägypten*. Freiburg: Atlantis Verlag, 1972.
- Shaw, Stanford. "The Established Ottoman Army Corps under Sultan Selim III." *Der Islam* 90 (1964): 142–184.
Excellent article on the late eighteenth century in Turkey, which covers much more than the title implies.
- . *The Financial and Administrative Organization of and Development of Ottoman Egypt, 1517–1798*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962.
- . "Landholding and Land Tax Revenues in Ottoman Egypt." In *Political and Social Change in Modern Egypt*, edited by P. M. Holt, pp. 91–103. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969.
- . *Ottoman Egypt in the Age of the French Revolution*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964.
- Al-Shayyāl, Jamāl al-dīn. "Doctor Peron and Two Shaykhs, al-Tūnisi and al-Ṭanṭāwī." *Majallat Kulliyat al-Ādāb* 2 (1944): 1–16.
- Skiotis, Dennis N. "From Bandit to Pasha: First Steps in the Rise to Power of 'Alī of Tepelen, 1750–1784." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 2 (1971): 219–244.
- Sobhy, George. *Lectures in the History of Medicine*. Cairo: Fuad I University Press, 1949.

- Stetkevych, Jaroslav. *The Modern Arabic Literary Language: Lexical and Stylistic Developments*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Strauss, Leo. *Natural Right and History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.
- Thédenat-Duvent, M. P. de. *L'Égypte sous Méhemet-Ali*. Paris: Chez Pillet-Ainé, 1822.
- Toderini, Abbé. *De la littérature des Turcs*. 2 vols. Paris: Chez Poincat, 1789.
A work of great insight and depth on eighteenth-century Turkish culture.
- Tomiche, N. "La Situation des artisans et petits commerçants en Égypte de la fin du XVIII^{ème} siècle jusqu'au milieu du XIX." *Studia Islamica* 12 (1960): 79–94.
- Toussoun, Omar [Ṭūṣūn, 'Umar]. "La Fin des Mamelouks." *Bulletin de l'Institut de l'Égypte* 15 (1933): 187–205.
- Trécourt, Jean-Baptiste. *Mémoires sur l'Égypte, 1791*. Edited by Gaston Wiet. Cairo: Royal Geographical Society of Egypt, 1942.
A primary source written by a French consul. Exceedingly useful for economic details.
- Trimingham, J. S. *The Sufi Orders in Islam*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.
- Ulken, Hilmi Ziya. "L'École wujūdite et son influence dans la pensée Turque." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 112 (1969): 193–208.
- Volney, Constantine. *Voyage en l'Égypte et en Syrie*. The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1959.
- Walz, Terence. "Notes on the Organization of the African Trade in Cairo, 1800–1850." *Annales Islamologiques* 11 (1972): 263–286.
A study of Egyptian-African commerce based on Egyptian and Sudanese archives.
- Watt, Ian. *The Rise of the Novel*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957.
- Wilson, Bryan. *Religion in Secular Society*. London: Watts, 1966.
- Wood, Alfred C. *A History of the Levant Company*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1935.
- Ziadeh, Nicola A. *Sanūsiya: A Study of the Revivalist Movement in Islam*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958.
- Zolondek, Leon. "The French Revolution in Arabic Literature in the Nineteenth Century." *Muslim World* 57 (1967): 202–211.

Index of Terms and Concepts

In this section I wish to share with my fellow Arabists my conviction of the need for a new type of Arabic lexicographical work. I have defined in context the technical terms of this study as they would be found in a dictionary. Yet I am aware that I have given meanings which applied in many cases one thousand or more years before. While this did not matter in the case of highly technical words, such as *qiyās*, meaning analogy in logic, when I came to define *ḥadīth* or *fiqh* or a number of other words which form the conceptual basis of this study, I was struck by the inadequacy of relying on their generic meaning. I had the feeling that I was giving the Latinate meaning of an English word without suggesting the way the meaning has evolved. In eighteenth-century Egypt the *ḥadīth* revival arose because of the situation in which the merchants found themselves. To say that *ḥadīth* is the sayings of the Prophet Muḥammad is not very helpful. To say that it is one of a number of mutually reinforcing aspects of law would be to ignore the features of the period which found *ḥadīth* in conflict with *fiqh*. A solution occurred to me while reading Raymond Williams' *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society* (1976). While I cannot work out, as he has, the history of the key words which are indices of social change, I might on a more modest scale try to define words to fit the study of the period of this book in a very brief way, and to hope that this idea will be taken up by linguists interested in the historical development of language. I justify my venture by pointing to the fact that the changes in culture and society in the eighteenth century called forth in the mind of al-Zabīdī the need for a total dictionary. As a first step, I decided to organize terms according to their social relationships, for the changing society highlighted the new relationships of terms to each other. There is a considerable risk inherent in this. The meaning of a given term depends on context. Categories derive their meaning not from being juxtaposed here but from being in conflict in certain concrete ways.

I. Law and Its Cultural Buttressing

A. Bureaucratic/Landowning Regimes (*fiqh* of the rulers), 53, 133ff

1. Institutions

a. Mosques, 33, 45, 124, 130, 140

b. Translation centers, missions, presses, 113, 123, 130, 145

2. Genres

a. Scholastic (the rational sciences as the base of *fahrasa* logic, *adab al-*

baḥṭh [argumentation], music, medicine, philology, engineering, sociology), 97, 110, 134, 148–149, 158

3. Orientations

a. Neoclassicism in Egypt, 93, 132–133, 155–156, 165, 175

b. Turkish classicism, 93, 156–157, 162, 168

c. Utilitarianism, positivism, realism (Māturidite theology), 92, 95, 112, 159

B. Commerce-based Regimes (*ḥadīth* of the rulers), 37–38, 51

1. Institutions

a. Mosques (al-Azhar, al-Zāhiriya), 123, 179

b. Salons (Majālis al-Wafā'iya, al-Bakriya-Khalwatīya), 38, 42, 46; [al-

Naqshbandīya), 59, 118, 119–120

2. Genres

a. Scholastic (the transmitted sciences as basis of *fahrasa*: history, literature, philology, medicine, chemistry, and physics), 57, 67

3. Orientations

a. Neoclassicism, 71, 83

b. Utilitarianism, positivism, realism (Māturidism), 46, 50, 54, 72

c. Proto-nationalism/defense of commerce, 27, 51, 69

C. Commercial/Artisanal Countercultures (*ḥadīth*)

1. Institutions

a. *Ṭuruq* (Bayyūmiya, Bektashiya, Ṭarīqa Muḥammadīya), 35, 47, 121–122

2. Genres

a. Scholastic (transmitted sciences, polemics), Chap. 3

b. Popular culture (Andalusian-Maghribi, colloquial), 84

3. Orientations

a. Antiregime ideology (Ash'arism, communalism), 96, 98, 118

II. Political Structures: The Dominant or Hegemonic Element

A. Industrial

1. England, France, 6, 28

B. Landowning/Bureaucratic Regimes on the Periphery

1. Egypt (Mamlūk Egypt, 1790–1805; Muḥammad Ali period), 11–19, 111–116

2. Ottoman Turkey, 98–100

C. Mercantile-Tribal Regimes on the Periphery

1. Egypt (Mamlūk-Hawwāra-minority merchant system, 1760–1780), 11

2. Syria (Damascus)

a. Wahhābī crisis, 100–101, 114

III. Regional Economic Structure

A. Commodities

1. Food stuff (wheat, rice, coffee), 3, 6–7, 26–27

2. Cotton, 5, Chap. 6

3. Water, 48

4. Luxury goods, 9, 18–19

B. Distributive System

1. Money lenders, 26

2. Trade networks (Syrian, Greek, Armenian, Muslim), 30, 101

a. Crisis of provisioning of cities (Cairo, Damascus, Istanbul, Marseilles), 6–7, 99, 101

3. World market, 4, 27

C. Organization of Production and Taxation

1. Tributary relationships

a. Guilds/artisans (butchers, water carriers, etc.), 24

b. Peasant communities, 26–27

2. Market relationships

a. Waged day labor (urban and rural), 25, 26, 118

IV. Social Structures

A. Institutions/Solidarities of Social Class

1. Women, 33, 129, 138, 142
2. Residential suburbs, 18, 189
3. Protection societies, 25
4. Şüfî orders, Chap. 2
5. Tribes of the eighteenth century, 13, 15, 29
6. Village chief system (rich peasant), 114–115

B. Institutions/Solidarities (cross-class)

1. Army, 121
2. Bureaucracy, 98–99, 115, 130–131
3. Orthodox law schools (Mālikî, Shāfi'î, Ḥanbalî, Ḥanafî), 67, 141, 146
4. Tribes of the nineteenth century, 153, 161

V. Science and Technology of the Islamic Mediterranean

A. Ruling Circles

1. Institutions
 - a. Medical (*māristāns*, hospitals), 167
 - b. Military (armies, navies), 194–195
 - c. Scholastic centers, 184
2. Genres
 - a. Physical medicine (pharmacology, veterinarianism, surgery), 152
 - b. Engineering (windmills, Euclidian geometry, military engineering), 174, 175, 176, 186
3. Orientations
 - a. Neoclassicist critique of Ibn Sīnā (empiricism, Māturîdite positivism), 105, 135–136, 172
 - b. Classicist reformulation of Ibn Sīnā, 109, 167–168

B. Middle Classes

1. Orientations
 - a. From Ibn Sīnā (*al-ḥikma*, astronomy, geography, mathematics), 149
 - b. Spiritual/psychological medicine, 44, 169–173
2. Institutions
 - a. Şüfî *ṭarîqa* (center of spiritual medicine), 44, 167
 - b. Scholastic centers, 58, 106–107
3. Technical domain
 - a. Spiritual medicine (group therapy, dream interpretation, etc.), 169

Index of Names

- 'Abd al-Khāliq, 39
 'Abd al-Rahman, Muḥammad b. (al-Azhari), 44
 'Abd al-Rahman Bey, 17, 79
 'Abd al-Rāziq Efendi, 39, 62
 'Abdu, Muḥammad (Shaykh), 138, 139, 148, 164
 'Abdullah, Ibn 'Umar (*mutakallim*), 145
 'Abdullah (Ottoman Pasha in Egypt), 70
 Abdullah Pasha (in Istanbul), 108
 Al-Abhari, Athir al-din, 147–148
 Abī'l-Faṭḥ (Amīr), 147
 Abū Anwār, Muḥammad. *See* al-Sādāt, Muḥammad Abī Anwār
 Abū al-Ashraf b. Wafā', Shams al-din Muḥammad, 39
 Abū al-'Āṣi, 'Uthmān, 138
 Abū Bakr, 43
 Abū Dhahab, Muḥammad Bey, 17, 18, 27
 Abū'l-Fida', 159, 162
 Abū Ḥanīfa, 51
 Abū Ḥayyān, 87
 Abū Musā al-Ash'ari, 71
 Abū Nuwwās, 58
 Abū 'Ubayda, 82
 'Adīla Ḥānīm bint Ibrāhīm Bey, 46
 Al-Afghānī, Jamāl al-din, 138
 'Ā'isha, 138, 160
 Al-Akrashī, Sulaymān, 55
 Āl Aḥmad, 40
 Āl Ṭaha, 40, 60
 Al-'Alawī, 'Alī b. 'Abdullah b. Aḥmad (al-Ḥanafī), 62
 Alfrī Bey, 31
 'Alī b. Abī Ṭalīb (Imām), 40, 48, 160
 'Alī Bey (al-Daftardār), 59
 'Alī Bey (al-Kabīr), 12, 16, 17, 24, 179, 186
 Al-'Āmilī, Bahā' al-din, 40, 175–176
 Al-Amīr, Muḥammad (al-Kabīr), 52, 59–60, 63, 66, 82–85, 125, 141
 Al-Anṣārī, Zakariyā', 147
 Al-Anṭākī, Da'ūd, 105, 107, 135, 169–172
 Al-'Aqqād, Yūsuf b. Aḥmad al-Dimashqī, 55
 Al-'Arīshī, 'Abd al-Rahman, 80
 Aristotle, 50, 93, 97, 132–134, 146, 150, 179
 Al-'Arūsī, Muṣṭafā, 44, 128
 As'adallah (craftsman), 19
 Al-Ashmūnī, Nūr al-din, 63, 66, 172
 Asim, Aḥmad (Mulla Effendi), 104
 Ataullah, Mehmet, 104, 106
 'Atā'ullah, Qāsim b., 60
 Al-'Aṭṭār, Asad, 128
 Al-'Aṭṭār, Ḥasan b. Muḥammad al-Khalwātī, 75–110, 123–132, 134–150, 154–162, 169–176, 183–185, 188, App. I–III
 Al-'Aṭṭār, Muḥammad b. Ḥusayn al-Ḥanafī al-Dimashqī, 103, 104, 107, 109, 184
 Al-'Aṭṭār, Muḥammad Kutn, 78
 Avicenna. *See* Ibn Sīnā
 Al-'Awḍī, al-Ḥasan b. 'Alī al-Badrī, 59–60
 Al-'Aynī, Abū Muḥammad Maḥmūd, 53
 Ayyūb Bey (al-Daftardār), 45
 Al-Azdī (grammarian), 83
 Al-Azhari, Khālīd, 63, 66, 83
 Al-Badawī, Aḥmad, 122
 Badr al-din, Yūsuf, 124
 Al-Baghdādī, 'Abd al-Laṭīf, 135, 170
 Al-Baghdādī, Khalīl Efendi, 79
 Al-Bājūrī, Ibrāhīm, 118, 146
 Al-Bakrī, 'Alī Efendi (al-Ṣiddīqī), 120, 124
 Bakrī, Mehmet Kemaleddin, 43
 Al-Bakrī, Muṣṭafā, 43, 46, 52, 108
 Al-Balīdī, Aḥmad, 186
 Al-Balī, Jarīr b. 'Abdullah, 137
 Al-Banānī, Muḥammad (al-Makkī), 124
 Al-Banānī, Muṣṭafā, 69
 Al-Bāqillānī, Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Ṭīb, 63, 159
 Al-Bāqir, al-Sayyid Muḥammad, 42
 Barbūr, Aḥmad, 107
 Al-Bārūdī, Sāmī, 164
 Al-Baṣrī, Ḥasan, 48
 Al-Bayḍāwī, 82, 136, 145, 147
 Al-Bayṭār, Ḥasan (al-Naqshbandī), 107–108

- Baytār, Yūsuf, 9
 Al-Bayyūmī, 'Alī, 47–49
 Berthier (chemist), 19
 Al-Bihārī, Muḥibb Allāh, 146
 Al-Birkāwī (Birghili), Mehmet Efendi (Pir), 134
 Bolyai, Janos, 177
 Bonaparte. *See* Napoleon
 Brockelmann, Carl, 65, 146
 Bruce, James, 6
 Al-Budayrī, Muṣṭafā, 135
 Būghus, Yūsuf, 33
 Al-Bukhārī, 49, 51, 53, 142
 Al-Bulāqī, Muṣṭafā, 140, 142
 Burghul, 'Alī Pasha (Wālī), 31

 Calvin, John, 46
 Catherine (Empress), 15, 16
 Cevdet Pasha, 126
 Chesterfield (Lord), 185
 Clot Bey, 130, 168, 187
 Comte, Auguste, 188

 Al-Damanhūrī, Aḥmad, 67, 186
 Al-Damanhūrī, Muṣṭafā, 46
 Al-Dānirānkawī, Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Kuthnāwī, 62
 Al-Dardīr, Aḥmad, 25, 44, 45, 56, 66
 Darwish, 'Alī, 158
 Al-Dawwānī, Jalāl al-dīn, 145, 147
 Desaix de Veygoux (General), 17
 Al-Dimashqī, Ḥusayn b. Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad al-Ḥanafī, 124
 Al-Dimyāṭī, Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Bidīrī, 55
 Al-Disūqī, Muḥammad ibn 'Arafa, 66, 82, 107, 134, 169
 Di Wolmar (Doctor), 186
 Al-Diyā'ī, Ḥasan, 62
 Al-Diyārbakarlī, Yūsuf (Shaykh), 54
 Al-Duda, Qāsim Daqqāq, 124
 Al-Dumnātī, Abū Ḥāmid al-'Arabī b. Muḥammad (al-Fāsī), 125, 148

 Eliot, T. S., 151
 Euclid, 176, 177

 Fakhr, Mikhā'il, 9
 Al-Fālakī, 'Abdullah Efendi al-Aṣṭuwānī, 107
 Farḥāt, Germanus, 153
 Al-Firūzabādī, 64, 65, 153
 Foucault, Michel, 167
 Franciscans, 27, 118
 Fūḍū, Muḥammad, 62

 Galen, 169, 170
 Ghālī (al-Mu'allim), 33
 Ghālīb (Amīr), 30
 Al-Gharbī, Aḥmad, 116
 Al-Gharbī, Muḥammad, 116
 Al-Ghayṭī, Najm al-dīn, 69
 Al-Ghazzālī, Abū Ḥāmid (Ḥujjat al-Islām), 51–52, 79, 173
 Goldmann, Lucien, 182
 Gupta, Ashin Das, 102

 Al-Ḥadramī, Shihāb al-dīn Aḥmad, 69
 Hajar, Wā'il b., 138
 Al-Hamadhānī, Aḥmad, 61
 Ḥāmid, Ḥajilān b., 101
 Hanish (Shaykh), 140
 Al-Ḥarīrī, Abū Muḥammad, 57–63, 157, 181
 Harvey, William, 94, 171, 184
 Al-Ḥasan, Abī Muḥammad (son of Fātima al-Zahrā'), 41
 Al-Ḥasan, b. 'Alī, 40, 137
 Al-Ḥifnāwī, Shams al-dīn Muḥammad b. Salīm, 43–44, 55, 58–59, 60, 66–67, 69–70
 Al-Ḥifnāwī, Yūsuf, 44, 95
 Hikmet Bey, Arif (Şeyh ul-Islam), 107, 125–127, 146, 157
 Al-Ḥimṣī, Muṣṭafā Zayn al-dīn, 108
 Hirst, Julian, 187
 Hobsbawm, Eric, 5, 177
 Holt, Peter M., 15
 Ḥusām al-dīn, 'Abd al-Laṭīf (al-Ḥalabī), 43
 Al-Ḥusayn b. 'Alī, 40, 137
 Al-Ḥusaynī, Aḥmad, 128–129
 Huwarith, Mālik b., 138

 Ibn 'Abbās, 52, 142
 Ibn 'Arabī, Muḥyī al-dīn, 46, 50, 98, 102, 108, 146, 158
 Ibn al-Baytār, Ḥasan, 169
 Ibn Fāris, Aḥmad, 153
 Ibn Hajar, 53, 65
 Ibn Hānī al-Andalūsī, 40
 Ibn Ḥazm, 50
 Ibn Hishām, 63, 66
 Ibn Jānī, 51
 Ibn Khaldūn, 63, 68, 159–161, 185
 Ibn al-Khaṭīb, Lisān al-dīn (al-Andalūsī), 125
 Ibn Mālik (grammarian), 63, 66
 Ibn al-Nafīs (al-Qurashī), 94, 106, 165, 170–172, 184

- Ibn Sahl, Ibrāhīm al-Andalūsī, 85–87, 108
 Ibn Sa'īd al-Maghribī, 148
 Ibn al-Ṣalāh (Imām), 107, 173
 Ibn Sayyid al-Nās, 69
 Ibn Shabānāt (Shubāna?), Muḥammad, 40
 Ibn Sinā, 93–94, 104–106, 109, 145, 167–172, 175, 183–184
 Ibn Taymiya, 140
 Ibrāhīm (son of Muḥammad 'Alī), 115
 Ibrāhīm Bey (Pasha), 10, 13, 16, 17, 30, 45–46
 Ibrāhīm Efendi, 13, 30
 Al-Idkāwī, Aḥmad b. 'Abdullah al-Salāma, 40, 59, 62
 Idris, Aḥmad, 122
 Al-Ījī, 'Aḥud al-dīn, 136
 Isma'il (Shaykh al-Balad), 18
 Isma'il (Khedive), 116, 120, 131, 157, 159, 163
 Isma'il Bey, 16, 25

 Al-Jabartī, 'Abd al-Raḥman, 16, 37, 42, 49, 54, 60, 69, 71–74, 76–77, 79–80, 87–91, 113, 141, 156, 179, 182
 Al-Jabartī, Ḥasan, 41, 52–53, 62, 80, 169
 Ja'far al-Ṣādiq (Imām), 42, 48
 Al-Jaghminī, Maḥmūd b. Muḥammad, 109
 Al-Jawharī, Muḥammad, 45, 64
 Jazzār, Aḥmad Ṣālim (Pasha), 25, 30, 42
 Jung, Carl Gustave, 169
 Al-Jurjānī, 'Abd al-Qāhir, 82, 176

 Al-Kafrāwī, Muḥammad, 67
 Kant, Immanuel, 132
 Al-Kāzim, Mūsā (Imām), 42
 Al-Khabīṣī, 'Ubaydullah, 148
 Khadimi-Zadeh, 135
 Khafājī, Abū Ishāq (al-Andalūsī), 87
 Al-Khafājī, Shihāb al-dīn, 39, 62, 65
 Khālid (Shaykh Ṭarīqa al-Khālidiya), 95, 108
 Al-Khālidi, Sa'īd, 108
 Al-Khalwati, Muḥammad, 46
 Al-Khashshāb, Isma'il, 40, 42, 60–61, 68, 76–77, 79–80, 84–85, 187
 Al-Khaṭṭāb, 'Umar b., 71
 Khayret Efendi, 157
 Al-Khudari, Ḥajjāj, 24
 Al-Khudri, Aḥmad 'Alī, 42
 Al-Khulāṣī, 'Abd al-Qādir, 109
 Al-Khulāṣī, Ibrāhīm, 108–109
 Al-Khulāṣī, Ṭālib, 109

 Khūsraw, Muḥammad (Pasha), 26
 Al-Khuwānki, Muḥammad b. 'Umar, 62
 Al-Kinānī, Ḥusayn b. Ḥasan (al-Ḥanafī), 26
 Kissling, Hans, 44
 Al-Kiwārli, 'Abdullah Pasha, 79
 Kléber (General), 29
 Al-Kurdi, Maḥmūd, 44

 Al-Lakhnāwī, Baḥr al-'Ulūm, 146
 Lane, Edward, 20, 32, 118, 120–122, 127, 130, 154, 162–163
 Al-Laḡānī, Ibrāhīm, 54
 Al-Laḡimī, Muṣṭafā As'ad al-Dimyātī, 59
 Lukács, Georg, 180
 Lusignan (the traveler), 12

 Magellon, Charles, 10
 Al-Mahdī, Muḥammad, 22
 Maḥmūd (Sultan), 70
 Maḥmūd Bey, 33
 Al-Mahrūqī, Sayyid Muḥammad, 32
 Al-Mālikī, Faṭḥallah, 124
 Al-Mallāwī (Shaykh), 147
 Al-Maqqarī (the historian), 186–187
 Al-Maqrizī, 161
 Al-Mar'ashī, Muḥammad (known as Sajaqli-Zadeh), 149
 Al-Marṣafī, Ḥusayn, 164
 Marsot, Afaf Lutfi al-Sayyid, xii
 Masson, Paul, 9, 16
 Mas'ūd, Aḥmad b. 'Alī b., 155
 Al-Mawardi, 73
 Mill, John Stuart, 188
 Mir Zāhid, 147, 148
 Al-Miširī, Muḥammad, 106–107
 Montesquieu, 161, 185
 Al-Mu'askari, Muḥammad Abī Ra's, 71
 Mubārak (Qāḍī), 146
 Mubārak, 'Alī Pasha, 78, 123, 124, 136, 164
 Muḥammad (the Prophet), 40, 69, 138, 142
 Muḥammad 'Alī (Pasha), xiv, 28, 31–33, 109, 111–121, 125–128, 140–141, 149, 156–157, 164, 181–185, 188
 Muḥammad Bey al-Alfi, 80
 Al-Mu'izz al-Fātimī, 40
 Al-Munīnī, Aḥmad al-Dimashqī, 70
 Murād Bey, 16–17, 19, 25, 29–30, 79, 89
 Al-Murādi, Muḥammad Khalil, 79
 Al-Murshidi, Bahā' al-dīn Muḥammad, 124
 Al-Muṣhib, Sa'īd, 137
 Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj, 53, 55

- Muṣṭafā Efendi (known as Bek Zadeh), 54
 Al-Muwayliḥī, Ibrāhīm, 164
- Al-Nābulusī, 'Abd al-Ghanī, 39, 43, 50, 59
 Nāfi', Muḥammad, 122
 Al-Nafrāwī, Muḥammad b. Isma'īl, 52
 Al-Najjār, Abū Ayyūb Khālīd b. Zayd, 70
 Al-Nakhli, Muḥammad Ṣādiq b. Aḥmad (al-Ḥanafī), 54–55
 Napoleon, 26, 28–30, 33–34, 89, 106–107, 167–168, 186–188
 Nasr, Hossein, 93
 Newton, Isaac, 163
 Niqūlā (Ra'īs), 17
- Perrée (Admiral), 29
 Perron, Nicholas (Doctor), 187–188
 Pliny, 10
 Ptolemy, 163
- Qāḍī Zadeh, Mūsā b. Muḥammad, 175, 176
 Al-Qastallānī, 53
 Al-Qaysūrlī, Muṣṭafā Efendi, 54
 Al-Qazwīnī (al-Kātibī), Najm al-dīn (Imām al-Ḥaramayn), 66, 137–138, 145
 Al-Qināwī, 'Umar (al-Ḥusaynī), 42
 Al-Quwaysnī, Ḥasan, 124, 127–129, 146
- Rāghib Muḥammad (Pasha), 12
 Raphael, Don, 153
 Raymond, André, 19, 20, 21, 25
 Al-Rāzī, Fakhr al-dīn (al-Qutb), 147, 173
 Al-Rāzī, Muḥammad al-Ṭabīb, 171
 Reshid, Mustafa, 126
 Ridwān al-Julft, 58–60
 Ridwān Katkhudā, 45
 Rodinson, Maxime, 181
 Al-Rumi, Ali b. Abdullah 62
- Al-Ṣabbān, Muḥammad, 41–42, 55, 63, 65–66, 68–70, 82, 139, 145, 147, 148
 Al-Sādāt, 'Abd al-Khāliq (known as Abū'l-Futūḥāt), 119
 Al-Sādāt, Aḥmad Abū al-Nāṣir b. Sayyid (known as Abū Iqbāl), 119
 Al-Sādāt, Muḥammad Abī Anwār, 22, 38–42, 59–61, 69, 119, 143
 Al-Ṣafāqsi, 'Abd al-Raḥman, 22, 40
 Al-Sakkākī, Yūsuf, 66
 Ṣāliḥ al-Fallāḥ (al-Ḥājī), 26
 Ṣāliḥ Pasha, 45
 Sami Pasha, Abderrahman, 126, 157, 175
 Al-Sammānī, Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Karīm, 43
- Al-Ṣanāwī, Muḥammad Ibn Abī Sa'id al-Kirkāsī, 141
 Al-Sannārī, Ibrāhīm, 16
 Al-Sānūsī, Muḥammad b. 'Alī (Imām), 139–143
 Al-Saqqā', Ibrāhīm, 119, 138
 Al-Ṣāwī, Muṣṭafā b. Aḥmad, 44–45, 48
 Sayyid, Awsīl b., 70
 Sayyida Nafisa (wife of Murād Bey), 30
 Selim III (Sultan), 92, 99–100, 103–104
 Servetus, Michael, 170
 Al-Shāfi'ī (Imām), 141
 Shani Zadeh (Shaykh), 106, 169
 Al-Sha'rānī, 'Abd al-Wahhāb, 41
 Sharif Efendi, 33
 Al-Sharqāwī, 'Abdullah, 21–22, 26, 35, 37, 44–46, 52, 56, 81, 90, 124, 134, 139
 Shaw, Stanford, 13
 Shidiyaq, Fāris, 153
 Shihāb al-dīn, Muḥammad, 126, 158–159
 Shirwānī, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Anṣārī, 154
 Al-Shubrāwī, 'Abdullah, 40, 67, 69–70
 Al-Shubrāwī, Muḥammad, 45
 Al-Sijā'i, Aḥmad, 55, 60, 63, 66, 148
 Al-Sijntī, Ibrāhīm, 45–46
 Sirbawwābīn, Ḥasan (Amir), 54
 Al-Sirsi, Mūsā, 53
 Al-Siyalkūti, 'Abd al-Hakīm, 148
 Al-Subki, 'Abd al-Wahhāb, 139
 Suḥayl, 'Abdullah b., 70
 Sulaymān (Mālik al-Maghrib), 125
 Al-Suyūṭī, Jalāl al-dīn, 82–83
 Al-Suyūṭī, Muḥammad b. Ridwān (Ibn al-Ṣalāḥī), 58, 60
- Al-Ṭaḥṭāwī, Rifā'a, 74, 97, 141–142, 157–159, 161–164, 185–186, 188
 Al-Ṭā'i, Muṣṭafā, 55
 Talleyrand, 10
 Al-Ṭaṭṭāwī, Muḥammad 'Iyād, 119, 182, 186
 Tchesmelis (Greek admiral of Murād Bey), 29
 Al-Tha'ālibī, 'Abd al-Mālik, 63
 Thonus, Baron de, 16
 Ṭīb, Muḥammad b. (al-Fāsi), 64
 Trécourt, Jean-Baptiste, 9–10
 Al-Tūsi, Nāṣir al-dīn, 98, 136, 145, 147, 161, 175–176
 Ṭuwayḥ, Fakhr al-dīn b. Muḥammad, 65
- Ubicini, M. A., 99
 'Umar Efendi (al-Sayyid), 106

Von Grunebaum, Gustave, xi

Wahhābīs, 65

Walīʿullāh, Shāh, 54, 139–140

Al-Waqāʿiʿ al-Miṣriya, 119, 126, 175

Al-Wardānī, Ibn al-ʾIkhlāṣ, 54

Weber, Max, 180, 188

Wiet, Gaston, 10

Al-Yāfi, Šālīh, 108

Al-Yāfi, ʿUmar, 108, 144

Yasīn b. Zayn al-dīn, 148

Yūsuf (Wazīr), 31, 33, 80

Yūsuf, Muḥammad b. (al-Firqī al-Zakī),
55

Al-Zabīdī, Muḥammad Murtaḍā, 39, 42,
51–52, 54–55, 60–65, 71, 74, 79, 123,
129, 139, 149, 152–153, 156, 181

Zadeh, Durri (Mufti), 100

Al-Zamakhsharī, 62

Zantiot, Ibrāhīm, 17

Zubayr, ʿAbdullah b., 137

Al-Zahrāʾ, Faṭīma, 40, 41

Al-Zurqānī, Muḥammad, 54